THREE LETTERS

DECLARING

The strange odd Proceedings of Protestant Divines, when they write against Catholicks: by the Example of Dr *Taylor's* Diffusive against Popery; Mr *Whitbies* Reply in the behalf of Dr *Pierce* against *Cressy*, and Dr *Owens* Animadversions on *Fiat Lux*.

This is yr some book of yr called Dr Taylor's

Recoll: Written by J. V. O. Anglo:

The one of them to a *Friend*,
The other to a *Foe*,
The third to a *Person Indifferent*.

Sepulchrum patens est guttur eorum, linguis suis dolose agunt. Judica illos Deus.

1671.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

The Occasion of this Epistle.

THE Author had wrote a little Book called Fiat Lux, *to shew that wrangling about Religion is irrational and fruitless. A Protestant, understood afterward to be Dr Owen, set forth Animadversions against that Book. And this Epistle acquaints the Doctor of some of the ill qualities of those his Animadversions.*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
2558.80

I.

An Epistle to the Author of the Animadversions upon Fiat Lux.

SIR,

I Was in my Journey in the North, far enough from *London*, when your *Animadversions* upon *Fiat Lux* came forth. Nor did I ever set eye upon them, till my return in *February*, about half a year after: which I tell you Sir, to excuse my silence. And now in brief. For your labour I thank you; for your endeavour I pity you; for your purpose I pardon you; that being as I believe, intended for Gentlemens satisfaction, the other for *Fiat Lux* his confutation: this for the *Authors* confusion.

I may not go about to reply unto you, becaus this would be against the very end and principles of *Fiat Lux* it self, which speaks forth nothing more then this; *That Controversies about Religion are vain and fruitless.* And lest this should not be able to detain me from any such reply, you adde your own threats, That if I

ſhall dare to write again, you will make me know what manner of man you are. However Sir, let we crave leave to thank you for the paſtime your *Animadverſions* have given me ſince my return.

But Sir, you miſtake the very drift and deſign of *Fiat Lux*, which makes you to erre ever and anon, throughout your whole Book, whiles you take that as ſpoken abſolutely which is only ſaid upon an *hypotheſis* of our preſent condition here in *England*, diſtraction, diſputes, and wars, in order to a contrary end of unity, love, and concord, deſigned by *Fiat Lux*; and the Proſopopeia's brought in by me, as *Solomon* in his *Eccleſiaſtes* makes the fool and atheiſt ever and anon to ſpeak their minds, theſe you conceiv to be my doctrin. By vertu of theſe capital miſtakes, what by me is ſaid of the obſcurity of God, Nature, and Providence, is with you impertinent; that of Light and Spirit, impious; that of Plea of Parties, frivolous; that of Reaſon, diſſonant and to no purpos; that of Scripture blaſphemous; that of the Hiſtory of Religion, no leſs inconſequent than untrue. In a word, this thing, that thing, every thing, a wilde, diſhoneſt illiterate diſcours.

Some would wonder, that he who writes in confutation of a Book, ſhould be himſelf the only man that underſtands it not. But the reaſon is apparent: It is your onely advantage to miſtake.

mistake. The whole discours of *Fiat Lux* chained together, one part with another, from that which is supposed to that which is designed, would breath so much of charity and sobernes, that my *Commentatour* could not have told how to make *any mad versions* upon it. It is not yet too late. Now that you have finished your *Animadversions*, or Comment, or Notes upon it, you may do well to take my Book again into your hands; read it calmly, and understand it.

That which you speak so frequently of *Fiat Lux* his ignorance, is not altogether amiss: for he pretends not much to learning, although he knows what he sayes. But yet Sir, if you had defied and villified him with less violence, and more seldom, and not so universally in every point of history, language, and philosophy, nor just then when you had least caus, it had been more for your honour. A third part of your Book, which is taken up in talking of my ignorance and other qualities, might well have been spared, had you had arguments to demonstrate it.

And in my minde you too much forget your self, when you recount so often with regret and anger, that som gentlemen of the land should through their own inconsideration, have any liking of a Book which you judg so slight, aiery, vain, fallacious, and simple. As if they had none, and you all the judgment of discerning,

Gentlemen, Sir, must be allowed a sens of Religion as well as Ministers, and their portion of reason must not therfor be les, becaus their Blood is more noble, the company they keep more accomplisht, and their education better. They have the body, although they wear not the Cloak of Religion, and masters they are of their own reason, tho not of yours. This is one difference between Catholik countreys and ours, that there the Clergy-man is only regarded for his vertue & the power he hath received, or is at least believed to have received from God in the great ministery of our reconciliation. And if he have any addition of learning besides, it is looked upon as a good accidental ornament, but not as any essential complement of his Profession. So that it often happens, without any wonderment at all, that the Gentleman Patron is the learned man, and the Priest his Chaplain of little or no science in comparison. But here in *England* our Gentlemen are disparaged by their own Black Coats, and not suffered to use their judgments in any kinde of learning, without a gybe from them. The Gentleman is reasonles, and the scribling Cassock is the only Schollar: he alone must speak all, know all, and only understand.

I cannot but smile to see you turn so dexterously every thing that is said in *Fiat Lux*, to your own use. His discours of innocence and mode-

moderation, gives you occasion to speak, and amply dilate of wars, murders, adulteries, lyes, hypocrisies, villanies: And when he cries, *Peace, Peace*, it is motive enough for you to cry, *Guns* and *Daggers*. You rave and rage against him and the whole earth; you load your pen and pages with the tyrannies, desolations, disorders have been aforetime in the world, not heeding that you had not so much as heard at this day of any such abuses, if their holy and renowned Clergy-men, who still declaimed against the vices of their times, had not left them upon record; or so much as considering, that even now in these best times of Reformation are as grand disorders in all kindes as ever were in the worst times of Popish corruption.

Nay there was never any crow or magpie so pecked and cawed upon the back of a sheep, as you do upon *Fiat Lux*, and if he do but stir or wag, you threaten, if I understand you right, to peck out his eyes. And all this, because *Fiat Lux* endeavours to show, that animosities about matters of Religion are groundless, prejudicial to peace and neighbourhood, ruinous, desolatory, endless, and consequently vain, fruitles, and sinful; (ther may indeed be som advantage on the Defendants side, which is not in the Plaintiff or Actour, but this at present I am not to take notice of) nay finally, that they have ever don much harm in Kingdoms, but never good.

In all this Sir, you do like your self, you love nois and whirlwinds, and when you hear of *Peace*, prepare your self to *Battle*: so ill do you understand the sound of a retreat, or, becaus it suits not with your ends and inclinations, will not.

But all this discours of *Fiat Lux*, tends, say you, to *Popery*. A fearful thing, and ungrateful news to Ministers; for whose foolish, endles, and ungrounded quarrels, we have lately engaged our honour, peace, livelihood, lives, and all that is dear unto us; and yet we are still, but where we were before we began. Nay, we are ten times farther off from any reconcilement, unity, or satisfaction then before. And such succes have all wars ever had, where the alarm was given in the Pulpit. But why must it tend to Popery? Becaus that *Fiat Lux* is bold to say, that *Popery* in its own likenes is not so ugly as we imagin it. Lord! what a strange thing is this, that either *Fiat Lux* or any els should presume to say, that we in *England*, or other Nations may be carried by the reports of som interested men, to think wors of a thing then it may deserv; especially considering that we com all to Church to hear Gods Words, and there meet with a man, who in the first opening of his lips, cryes, *Hearken my Beloved to the word of the Lord*, and so having with that airy honeycomb sweetned the edges of our ears, pours into them

them afterward what poiſon of his own conceived intereſts he pleaſes; all which we his *dearly beloved* let down greedily into our hearts, as that precious word of the Lord which he at firſt proclaimed. By which fallacies, we have been in the time of theſe our late wars, ſo far inveigled, (I ſpeak to men now alive, who all know I ſpeak true) that it became then a moſt dangerous thing, yea, treaſon it ſelf, to ſay, *God ſave the King*, who was by this our Pulpit rhetorick made as odious then throughout the land, as Popery, what ever it be, ever was or can be. And are not neighbours thus abuſed daily almoſt in every thing? Where is that man, who hath not by ſuch like means been one time or other induced to think amiſs, even of his moſt innocent and deareſt friends, till himſelf by trial found the contrary? *O but God forbid*, you will ſay, *that ever we ſhould come by trial to know what Popery is.* Sir, may it be far from us, ſo long as heaven pleaſes. But i'th interim, what harm can it be to us to mitigate our paſſions? which if there be no miſtake, are prejudicial notwithſtanding to our own peace; and if a miſtake there ſhould be, are double injurious, and deſperately ſinful before God and man. *Oh but miſtake there can be none!* Sir, let me tell you roundly. By your own Book of *Animadverſions* I do as clearly ſee, as ever I beheld Sun in the Firmament, that you do not your ſelf underſtand what

Pope-

Popery is; even no more, then the pooreſt meaneſt peaſant in the Pariſh. But who is able to make this good and clear unto you? no body Sir, ſo long as you are in paſſion, in a calm of indifferency your very ſelf. Nor could I without that ſerenity, have been ever able to diſcern it. But yet, there is one thing more, which will hinder your acknowledgement, although you ſhould come to know it. It is their intereſt to juſtifie themſelvs, and yours to condemn them.

Had not you with your threats ſo much frighted me from any thought of writing any more, I could I think my ſelf, who am in your judgement one of the greateſt ingrams in the Land, make it yet appear, that the preſent Popiſh Religion, if to pleas you they will give me leave to call it ſo, is not only leſs ugly then we conceive it, but far more innocent and amiable then I have made it. And, if there were not ſo much as one Catholik, or Romaniſt, or Papiſt upon earth, yet ſo far am I from any intereſt herein, that in that judgment I would notwithſtanding dy alone. Nor had I ſet before my eyes any other end in that my *Fiat* of moderation, againſt which you write your hot *Animadverſions*, then the peace and welfar of my Countrey, which under the pretended ſhadow of Popery, inflamed by the alarms of *Vicars* and their *Wives*, for whom we fight as it were *pro aris & focis*, hates and miſchiefs, ſtrikes and deſtroyes one another with-

without end. And yet, which is a ſtrange thing, whilſt every one conceits himſelf to fight for *Purity* of Goſpel againſt *Popery*, they fight all for *Popery* againſt *Purity* of Goſpel. And this you muſt affirm your ſelf, if you do but remember what in your Book of *Animadverſions* you ſo frequently aſſert; that what good ſoever the *Papiſts* or Roman Catholiks either do or have amongſt them, they have and do the ſame as *Chriſtians*, and not as *Papiſts*; and that Popery is it ſelf nothing els, but pride, intereſt ambition, tyranny, worldly reſpects, thirſt of blood, affectation of dominion, *&c.* As I am ſure on the other ſide, that grace, charity, and peace is the pure quinteſſence of Goſpel, and the very extract of true Religion. Either then I had reaſon to tell you, that you underſtand not what *Popery* is; or if you do, you muſt needs acknowledge, that thoſe who here in *England*, betwixt the years of 1640. and 1660. with guns and daggers, as you often phraſe it, with field rhetorick and pulpit cannon, ſubverted all before them, even Church and State too, let them call themſelvs *Puritans*, *Independents*, *Presbyterians*, or what they pleas, were all of them by this your own rule, as *arch Papiſts* as ever trode upon the earth. Nor is it of concernment, ſo they have the reality of the thing, whence they may borrow their name; whether ſome man upon earth be their *Pope*, or whether the *Devil* be

be himself their ghostly father.

And I fear Sir, you wer your self some part of that dismal tempest; which in the last years of our woful *Anarchy* overbore all before it, not only Church and State, but reason, right, honesty, all true Religion, and even good natur too. The very flashings of your pen move me to this thought. The whole physiognomy of your Book speaks the hot and fiery spirit of the Authour. First, you cannot abide to hear of *moderation*, it is with you most wicked, hypocritical, and devillish, especially as it coms from me. And for this one thing *Fiat Lux* suffers more from you, then for all the contents of the Book put together. My reason is your passion; my moderation inflames your wrath; and you are therfor stark wild, becaus I utter so much of sobriety. Secondly, your so frequent talking of *sword and blood, fire and faggot, guns and daggers*, do more then show, you have not yet let go those hot and furious imaginations. It is a phrase so ordinary with you, that when another writer of your own judgment would have told me, that my words are false or besides the purpos, or the like, you in a phrase of your own tell me still that I speak guns and daggers. *If he mean*, say you of me, p 27. *that ther is in good works an intrinsecal worth*, &c. *he speaks daggers, and doth not himself beleev what he sayes.* And again, p. 94. *For men to come now in the end of the world,*

world, and tell us, That we must rest in the autority of the present Church, &c. is to speak daggers and swords to us, upon a confidence that we will suffer our selves to be befoold. So likewise p. 340. *He tells us,* say you of me, *it is good to prefer a Translation before the Originals. What shall we do with those men that speak such swords and daggers, and are well neither full nor fasting.* I pray Sir where did you borrow this trope? had you it from the school of Aristotle, or Mars his camp?

Thirdly, your prophetick *assurance* so often inculcated, that if *you could but once com to whisper me in the ear, I would plainly acknowledg, either that I understand not my self what I say, or if I do, beleev it not,* givs a fair character of those fanatick times, wherin ignorance and hypocrisy prevailed over worth and truth; wherof if your self wer any part, it is no wonder you should think that I or any man els, should either speak he knows not what, or beleev not, what himself speaks. It was the proper badg of those times, when after the alarm sounded in the Pulpit, that our people therupon went forth in troops to battle, neither did the peasant understand, nor the man in black beleev, although the sound rung generally in their ears, that it was *the sword of the Lord and of Gideon*, which they brandisht against the loyal band, their foes. Measuring me it seems by your self, you tell me no less than seaven times in your book, that

I beleev not, and I think seaventy times, that I understand not what I speak my self. It is a kind of charity in you to think your neighbour is as you know your self to be. But I do not much care for that charity, except you were better than I find you are.

Fourthly, your pert assertion so often occurring in your book, that *ther is neither reason, truth, nor honesty in my words*, is but the overflowing of that former intemperat zeal: and the more frequent it occurs, the less approbation it will find. Fiftly, your sharp and frequent menaces, that if I write or speak again, I shall hear more, find more, feel more, more to my smart, more than I imagin, more than I would, rellishes too much of that insulting humour our bleeding Land then groaned under, the many years of our anarchical confusion. Sixthly, the absence of your *name* in the frontispiece of your book, which I have never before observed in all my life of any Protestant writer, that hath ever in my time set forth a book here in *England* against Popery, givs no small suspicion that the Authour of our *Animadversione* is no such *Protestant* as he would be thought to be. Lastly, that I may omit other special reasons, your other general trick of charging me then most of all with *fraud, ignorance, and wickedness*, when in your own heart you find me most clear from any such blemish, thereby to put a vail upon your own cause, which would

would otherways be disparaged, makes me smell a fox, a notorious one. *Sic notus Ulysses.* This has been too often acted here in *England* to be soon forgotten. The better the cause, the lowder still was the cry against those who stood for it; that the blustering nois of calumnies might drown all report of their innocence. And by all this I cannot Sir but suspect, that if the description of Popery your Animadversions givs us be right, you are a Papist your self, and no true Protestant, a notorious Papist. But as it is, so let it be.

Thus much I only tell you, that you may see I am neither neglective of your book, nor idle; but have perused and read it over. And although what for the threats of your *Animadversions*, and what for the reasons of my own *Fiat*, I may not enter into controversie: yet I hope I may let you know that I have seen your work. And that you may the better credit me, I will give you a short account of it, first in general; then in particular. And this is all I mean here to do.

The whole design of *Fiat Lux* you do utterly mistake, throughout all your book of *Animadversions*; so that you conceiv that to be a controversy, which is none; that to be absolutely asserted, which is but hypothetically discoursed out of the exceptions of other men; that to be only for one side, which is indifferently for all;

all; although I speak most for them that are most spoken against, and am in very deed absolutely against all speaking, quarrelling, disputing about Religion. If you will but have patience to hear my purpos and design, which to all men not interested and blinded with a prejudice, is clear enough relucent in the whole context of my *Fiat*, what I say will easily appear to your self. *Fiat Lux* sayes one thing, and supposes it; another thing he desires and aims at: that he dislikes; this he commends. We are at this day at variance about Religion, this *Fiat Lux* supposes. But it were better to have peace; this he aims at and desires. And both these things are intermingled up and down in my book, according to that small faculty that God hath given me, though not according to the usual method that is found now adayes in books. Here Sir in few words you have the summe of my *Fiat*. And I hope you will grant that to be the scope of my book, which I made it for. That we are now at variance is most clear and certain; by me supposed, and not to be denied. And that it were better to have peace, is as absolutely expedient, as the other is evidently true. These then being things both of them which no man can resist; either by denying the one, or disliking the other; I thought them better intermingled then set apart; and with more reason to be supposed, then industriously proved.

Yet

Yet to superinduce a disposition unto peace, my only work was to demonstrate an uselesnes, an endlesnes, an unprofitablenes of quarrels, which I laboured quite through my book; beginning it with an intimation of our quarrels, which St. *Paul* calls the fruits and works of the flesh, and ending it with a commendation of charity, which is the great fruit and blessing of Gods holy Spirit. Now the easier to perswade my Countreymen to a belief both of the one and the other, first is insinuated in *Fiat Lux*, both the ill grounds and worst effects of feuds; then is the plea of parties specified, their probabilities acknowledged, and lastly an impossibility of ever bringing our debates to a conclusion, either by light or spirit, reason or scriptur texts, so long as we stand separated from any superiour judicative power, unto which all parties will submit, is I think with a strong probability, if not demonstrative evidence concluded. And therfor is it thought by *Fiat Lux* to be more rational and Christian-like, to leav these endles, groundles, and ruinous contentions, and resign our selvs to humility and peace. This is the design and whole summe of my book. And although I speak up and down, here for *Papists*, there for *Protestants*, elswhere for *Presbyterians* or *Independants*, commonly out of the very discourses they make for themselvs; yet do I not defend either their wayes, or their arguments.

Nor do I teach any doctrin at all, or hold there any opinion. But I only giv to understand in that one little book, what is largely discourſed in a hundred, *That all parties do make out to themſelves ſuch a probability, which as it ſtands joyned with the actours reſolution, and ſeparated from any ſuperiour viſible power to which they will ſubmit, can never be ſubdued.* And hath not long experience proved this as true as any thing els? What then is ther in *Fiat Lux* that can be denied? Is it not evident that we are now at variance? and too long indeed have been. Is it not alſo clear, that peace, charity, and neighbourhood is better then variance, diſſention, and wars? Do not parties ſtrongly plead for themſelvs, ſo far perſwaded each one that himſelf is in the right, that he will not yield, the truth to be with any but himſelf. Is not all this evident? I am ſure it is; and all *England* will witnes it.

And if any one ſhould be able to evince, that any reaſonings made in *Fiat Lux* either for *Papiſts*, *Proteſtants*, or others, be not certain, or perhaps not probable; yet he does nothing, except he be able to prove likewiſe, that they are not probable to *Fiat Lux*, or to thoſe that uſe them, whether *Proteſtants* or *Papiſts*; which he can no more do, than he can pull a ſtar out of the firmament. I ſay Sir again, and mark I pray you, what I ſay. If you ſhould chance to evince

that

that the reasons brought by *Fiat Lux* either for the doctrin or practises of Papists or others, be either not probable or untrue, yet is your labour all in vain, except you be able to demonstrate likewise, that they are not probable to *Fiat Lux*, or to Papists and others who use those reasons; which you can no more do, then any thing that is absolutely impossible. By this time Sir, you may discern how hard it is to deal with *Fiat Lux*, and impossible to confute him. Sith he speaks nothing, but what is as clearly true and evident, as what we see at mid-day. Nor do I in this any way exalt the ability of the Authour, whom you are pleased so much and frequently to disable. A Tom-fool may say that, which all the wisemen in the world cannot gain-say: as he did, who said the Sun was higher at noon, than any other hour of the day. It was *Fiat Lux* his fortune rather then chois, to utter words which will no sooner be read, than acknowledged. And it was your misfortune Sir, to employ your greater talents in refuting evident truths; perhaps for no other reason, but becaus they issued from the pen of a man, who is not so great a friend to faction, as you could wish. And although you proceed very harsh and furiously; yet am I verily perswaded, you now discern, though too late for your credit, that you had all this while, according to our English proverb, good Mr. Doctor, a wrong sow by the ear.

Thus far in general. Now briefly to give you som account in particular.

You spend four Chapters, and a hundred and eighteen pages, which is the fourth part of your book, before you com to the first line and paragraff of mine, *The applaus and honour of this world*, &c. And it is not unwittily done. For being to be led, as you heavily complain, out of your ordinary road of controversies, by the wilde chase of *Fiat Lux*, it behoved you to draw som general common places of your own, for your self to walk in, and exercise your rhetorick and anger, before you pursue a bird that flies not, you say, in any usual tract.

Preface from page 1. to page 19.

Your preface, wherin you speak of my subtilty and your own pretence, affords me nothing but the beginning of your own mistake, which will run quite through your book.

1 Chap. from page 19. to 29.

Your first chapter beats me about the pate, for saying that I conceal my method, with a terrible syllogistical dilemma, *He that useth no method*, say you, *cannot conceal it*, and *if he hath concealed it, he hath used one*. But I must pass by store of such doughty stuff, being only fit for the young *Oxford* Schollar, who being com home to take air, would prove before his father and mother, that two eggs were three. Then going

going on you deny, that *Protestants ever opposed the doctrin and merit of good works*; which at first I wondered at, seeing the sound of it has rung so often in mine own ears, and so many hundred books written in this last age, so apparently witnes it in all places, till I found afterwards in my thorow perusal of your book, that you neither heed what you say, or how much you do deny. But you perhaps love to talk of them better than your fore-fathers did, though your thoughts be all the same. And you will all equally bless your selvs from building of Churches as the Papists have don, however your prattle goes.

2 Chap. from page 29. to 110.

Your second chapter collects out of *Fiat Lux*, as you say, ten general conclusions, spread all over like veins and arteries, in the body of that my book. And this you do, that you may make your self a *campus Martius* to sport in, without confinement to my method. But you name not any page of my book, where those principles may all or any of them be found. And you do wisely: For in the sence those words do either naturally make out, or in which you understand them, of all the whole ten I cannot own any one for mine own, set down in my book. The first of my principles must be this, *That we received the Gospel first from* Rome. In your sence I never spoke this. We, that is, we English first re-

received it thence. But you talk against it, as if I meant that Brittans had it first from *Rome*. *We had it not first from Rome*, say you, *but by Joseph of Arimathea from Palestin, as Fiat Lux himself acknowledges.* Sir, if *Fiat Lux* say both these things, he cannot mean in your contradictory fals sence, but in his own true one. We, that is, we Englishmen, the now actual inhabitants of this Land, and progeny of the Saxons, received first our Gospel and Christendom from *Rome*; though the Brittans who inhabited this Land before us, differing as much from us as *Antipodes*, had some of them been Christned long before us. And yet the Christendom that prevailed and lasted among the Brittans, even they also as well as we, had it from *Rome* too: mark this likewise. But you reply, *Though persons from Rome did first plant Christianity among the Saxons, was it the Popes Religion they taught? did the Pope first finde it out? or did they Baptise in the name of the Pope?* Good Sir, it was the Popes Religion, not invented by him, as your cavil fondly imagines, but owned, professed, and put in practice by him, and from him derived unto us by his missioners. You adde, *Did not the Gospel come to Rome as well as to us? for it was not first preached there.* Sir, properly speaking, it came not so to *Rome*, as it came to us. For one of the twelve fountains, nay two of the thirteen, and those the largest and greatest, was transferred to *Rome*, which

which they watered with their blood: we had never any such standing fountain of Christian Religion here, but only a stream derived to us from thence.

My second assertion must be, *From whom we first received our Religion, with them we must still abide.* This principle as it is never delivered by *Fiat Lux*, though you put it upon me, so is it in the latitude it carries, and wherin you understand it, absolutely fals, never thought of by me, and indeed impossible. For how can we abide with them in any truth, who may perhaps not abide in it themselvs. Great part of *Flanders* was first converted by Englishmen, and yet are they not obliged, either by *Fiat Lux*, or any *lux* whatsoever, to accompany the English in our now present wayes. If *Rome* first taught us Christianity, she may then rather plead a power to guide us, than we her. This or some such like thing I might speak, and rationally speak it. But that we or any other should be obliged still to abide or rather to follow them who first taught us Religion, though they should themselvs forsake their own doctrin, as you would make me speak, is a piece of folly never came into my thoughts. And you may be ashamed to put it upon me: Why do you not set down my own words, and the page of my book where I delivered this principle.

My third must be, *The Roman Religion is still*

the same. This also I do no where formally express, nor enter into any such common place: You will say I suppose it. But doth this justifie you who say here, that I assert it as a principle; let it then be supposed, for I do indeed suppose it, becaus I know it hath been demonstrativly proved a hundred times over. You deny it has bin proved, why do you not then disprove it? Becaus *you decline*, say you, *all common places*. Very good, so do I; let us com to proper ones. You fall then upon my Queries in the end of my book. *The Roman was once a true flouriſking Church, and if ſhe ever fell, ſhe muſt fall either by apoſtaſie, hereſie, or ſchiſm, &c.* So I speak there. And to this you reply, that *the Church that then was in the Apoſtles time, was indeed true, not that Roman Church that now is*. So, so; then say I, that former true Church muſt fall then, ſom time or other; when did ſhe fall, and how did ſhe fall? by apoſtacy, hereſy, or ſchiſm? *Perhaps*, say you, *neither way: for ſhe might fall by an earthquake*. Sir, we speak not here of any casual or natural downfall or death of mortals by plague, famine, or earthquake, but a moral and voluntary laps in faith. What do you speak to me of earthquakes! You adde therfor the second time, that *ſhe might fall by idolatry; and ſo neither by apoſtacy, hereſy, or ſchiſm*. Good Sir, idolatry is a mixt misdemeanour both in faith and manners: I speak of the single one of faith.

And

And he that falls by idolatry, if he keep ſtill ſome parts of Chriſtianity entire, he falls by hereſy; by apoſtacy, if he keep none. At laſt finding your ſelf puſled, in the third place you lay on-load; *She fell*, ſay you, *by apoſtacy, idolatry, hereſy, ſchiſm, licentiouſnes, and prophanenes of life.* And in this you do, not much unlike the drunken youth, who being bid to hit his maſters finger with his, when he perceived he could not do it, he ran his whole fiſt againſt it. But did ſhe fall by apoſtacy? *By a partial one*, ſay you, *not a total one.* Good Sir, in this diviſion, apoſtaſy is ſet to expres a total relaps; in oppoſition to hereſy, which is the partial. Did ſhe then fall by hereſy, or partial apoſtaſy, in adhering to any error in faith, contary to the approved doctrin of the Church? Here you ſmile ſeriouſly, and tell me, that *ſince I take the Roman and Catholik Church to be one, ſhe could not indeed adhere to any thing but what ſhe did adhere unto.* Sir I take them indeed to be one; but here I ſpeak *ad hominem*, to one that does not take them ſo. And then, if indeed the Roman Church had ever ſwerved in faith, as you ſay ſhe has, and be her ſelf but as another ordinary, particular Church, as you ſay ſhe is; then might you find ſom one or other more general Church, if any ther were, poſſitively to judg her; ſom Oecumenical councel to condemn her; ſom fathers either greek or latin, expreſly to write againſt

againſt her, as Proteſtants now do; ſom or other grave ſolemn autority to cenſur her; or at leaſt ſom company of beleevers out of whoſe body ſhe went, and from whoſe faith ſhe fell. Since you are no wayes able to aſſign any of theſe particulars, my Query remains unanſwered, and the Roman ſtill as flouriſhing a Church, as ever ſhe was.

The fourth aſſertion, *frequently*, ſay you, *pleaded by our Authour is, that all things as to religion were ever quiet and in peace, before the Proteſtants relinquiſhment of the Roman Sea.* This principle you pretend is drawn out of *Fiat Lux*, not becaus it is there; but only to open a door for your ſelf, to expatiate into ſom wide general diſcours, about the many wars, diſtractions, and factious altercations, that have been aforetime up and down the world, in ſom ſeveral ages of Chriſtianity: And yon therfor ſay *it is frequently pleaded by me*, becaus indeed I never ſpeak one word of it. And it is in truth a fals and fond aſſertion. Though neither you nor I can deny, that ſuch as keep unity of faith with that Church, can never ſo long as they hold it, fall out upon that account. If you had either cited the place, or ſet down my own words, they would have ſpoke their meaning. I might ſay perhaps, that our Land had no part of thoſe diſturbances upon the account of religion all the thouſand years it was Catholik, which it hath

ſuf-

ſuffered in one age ſince, or the like. But that all things ſhould ever be at quiet throughout the world, that ther ſhould no hereſies riſe, no ſeditions, no wars any where; this is a fanſy that was never in my head; and I wonder how it ſhould drop into my paper. But you are a martial man, and reſolved to bring me in with pikes and guns, as the red-coat ſouldiers did the Cavaliers in the time of our late anarchy, to ſuffer not only for the good they acted, but for the ill they never thought of.

Fift muſt be, *that the firſt reformers were moſt of them contemptible perſons, their means indirect, and ends finiſter.* Where is it Sir, where is it, that I meddle with any mens perſons, or ſay they are contemptible, or their means indirect, or ends finiſter? Where do I ſay all this? Do I ſpeak any word of Reformers of Religion in general, as you make me to do. But this you adde of your own, in a vaſt univerſal notion, to the end you may bring in the apoſtles and prophets, and kings, into the liſt of perſons by me ſurnamed contemptible, and liken my ſpeech, who never ſpeak any ſuch thing, to the ſarcaſms of *Celſus, Lucian, Porphiry, Julian,* and other Pagans.

So likewiſe in the very beginning of this your ſecond chapter you ſpend four leaves in a parallel betwixt me and the pagan *Celſus*, wherof ther is not any one member of it true. *Doth*

Fiat

Fiat Lux, say you, *lay the caus of all the troubles, disorders, tumults, wars within the nations of Europe upon the Protestants? Doth he charg the Protestants, that by their schisms and seditions they make a way for other revolts? doth he gather a rapsody of insignificant words? doth he insist upon their divisions? doth he manage the argument of the Jews against Christ*, &c. *So doth Celsus, who is confuted by learned Origen*, &c. Where does *Fiat Lux*, where does he, does he, does he any such thing? Are you not ashamed to talk at this rate? I give a hint indeed of the divisions that be amongst us, and the frequent argumentations that are made to embroil and pusle one another, with our much evil, and little appearance of any good, in order to unity and peace, which is the end of my discours. But must I therfor be *Celsus*? Did *Celsus* do any such thing to such an end? It is the end that moralises and specifies the action. To diminish Christianity by upbraiding our frailties is paganish: to exhort to unity by representing the inconvenience of faction, is a Christian and pious work. When honest Protestants in the Pulpit speak ten times more full and vehemently, against the divisions, wars, and contentions that be amongst us, than ever came into my thoughts; must they therfor be, every one of them a *Celsus*, a pagan *Celsus*? what stuff is this! But it is not only my defamation you aim at, your own

glory

glory coms in the reer. If I be *Celsus*, the pagan *Celsus*; then must you forsooth be *Origen* that wrote against him, honest *Origen*. That is the thing. Pray Sir, it is but a word, let me me advise you by the way, that you do not forget your self in your heat, and give your wife occasion to fall out with you. However you may, yet will not she like it perhaps so well, that her husband should be *Origen*.

My sixt principle must be, *That our departure from Rome hath been the caus of all our evils*. This is but the same with the fourth, in other words, but added for one to make up the number. And it is, you say, *every where spread over the face of Fiat Lux*. Sir you may say what you pleas, to be in his face, but I know best what is in the heart and bowels, both of *Fiat Lux*, and his Authour. And sure I am this never came into my thoughts. Our dissentions in faith may well multiply, as we see with our eyes they do, by our further departur from unity; and this may caus much evil: But the branches of our too too manifold evils found among the sons of men, spread all, as *Fiat Lux* also speaks, from that fertil root of our innate concupiscence, which by evil customs rises up into a thick bole of vitious inclinations, while we study not to impair, but rather to augment and nourish it. However I must give you leave to number this among my silly principles, to the end you may talk more copiously of

the

the disputes, and wars and broils that are and have been in several parts of Christendom, and fall again into your much affected and often iterated strain. *So the Pagans judged the Primitive Christians*, &c. And I must still be the Pagan, and you the Primitive Christian.

Seventh is, *There is no remedy of our evils, but by a returning to the Roman Sea.* This and the principle foregoing, had not you warily cloven a hair, had been all one, and both are equally mine. But Sir, that may remedy our difference in faith, which neither can nor will prevent varieties in philosophy or other worldly judgements: nor considering the infinite diversity of mens humours, is there any one thing equally prevalent with all men, and at all times, to the like good effect; and if it do certainly help one evil, it is not therfor a remedy for all. But it seems you have yet a little more mirth and choller to vent, and therfor I must permit you to adde this principle for mine, that you may smilingly consider, how the Romans should cure our evils, that cannot prevent disorders, differences, and sins amongst themselvs. I can tell you Sir another remedy of our evils, that we suffer about dissentions in Religion, besides that. If the King and Parliament would pleas to give back all the ecclesiastical livings into the hands of secular gentlemen, who out of a blind zeal, as you phrase it, gave them up aforetime

time unto the pious uſes of ſpirituall men now no more extant, all our controverſies and the evils thence enſuing would ſoon ceas. Even you zealous Sir, would be then as quiet, as a wolf tumbled into a pit-fall. Other remedies I could yet acquaint you with, more than one or two. If you did Sir really, and not in words only acknowledge any one ſuperiour governour in the land, unto whoſe power and judgment you would heartily all of you reſign, the word of that Oracle would ſolve all doubts, and end all your quarrels. But you will never do it. The very genius of the Reformation is wholly ſet againſt it.

The eight follows, *That Scriptur on ſundry accounts is inſufficient to ſettle us in the truth.* And in this you flouriſh and triumph moſt copiouſly for fifteen pages together, as the champion of the word of God. But Sir, you ſpeak not one word to the purpos, or againſt me at all, if I had delivered any ſuch principle, which I never did. Gods word is both the ſufficient and only neceſſary means both of our converſion and ſettlement as well in truth as vertue. But Sir, the thing you heed not, and unto which I only ſpeak, if I any where hint at ſuch a thing, is this: If the Scriptur be in two hands, for example of the Proteſtant Church in *England*, and of the Puritan, who with that ſcriptur roſe up and rebelled againſt her, can the ſcriptur alone of it

ſelf

ſelf decide the buſines, how ſhall it do it, has it ever don it? or can that written word now ſolitary and in private hands ſo ſettle any in a way that neither himſelf nor preſent adherents, nor future generations ſhall queſtion it, or with as much probability diſſent from it either totally or in part, as himſelf firſt ſet it. This Sir is the caſe, unto which you do neither here nor in all your whole book ſpeak one word. And what you ſpeak otherwis of the Scripturs excellency, I allow it for good. What is not againſt me, is with me. But no law whatſoever, whether divine or humane can be a ſufficient rule to men, if no judge overſee it.

Ninth, *The Pope is a good man, and ſeeks nothing but our good.* This alſo I no where aver. I might mention the care and induſtry of that Sea, and affirm it to be unworthily traduced. But I never ſaw any Pope, nor have I any ſuch acquaintance with him, as to know whether he be a good man in your ſence or no, free from pride, anger, covetouſnes, &c. though in charity I do not uſe to judg hardly of any body. Much leſs could I ſay, that he whom I know to have a general ſolicitude for all Churches, ſeeks nothing but our good. Sir, if I had pondered my words in *Fiat Lux*, no better than you heed yours in your *Animadverſions* upon it, they might even go together both of them to lap pepper and ſpice, or ſom other yet more vile employment.

Tenth

Tenth, that *the devotion of Catholiks far transcends that of Protestants.* But Sir I never made in *Fust Lux* any comparison between their devotions, nor do I remember that I ever so much as mentioned the devotion of Protestants. But you are the maddest *Commentatour* I have ever seen, you first make the *Text*; and then *Animadversions* upon it. Here at length you conclude your chapter, and *would*, say you, *your book also; if you had none to deal with, but ingenious and judicious readers.* It seems what follows, is for readers neither judicious nor ingenious. And becaus I knew you took me for one of those, I went on in my view. Indeed, had I not undertaken to give you an account of your whole book, I could have been well content to stop here with ingenious and judicious readers, and look no further. Doubtles in this affair good wits will jump. You would write no more, had you none but judicious readers; and these will read no more, becaus they are judicious. But I poor ass must jogge on.

3 ch. from page 110. *to* 119.

Your third chapter concerns my preface, which in part you allow, and partly dislike. And I am equally content with both.

4 or 5 ch. from page 119. *to* 148.

Your fourth chapter by mistake of press is named fift, and so I must here call it. It begins my book, and takes up five of my paragraffs at

once. You have loitered long about the gate like a trifling idlesbee, and means now it seems, when you come to my own words, to go nimbly over them, as of lesser concernment than your own foreſtalled conceits, which you have hitherto made ſport with. You firſt ſet up a maypole, and then danced about it, and now at length half tired, and almoſt out of breath, you come home to me.

My firſt paragraff about *Diverſity of ſects* you do not much except againſt. But I ſee you do not affect the *ſchoolmen*, haply for the ſame reaſon the French love not *Talbot*, having been uſed in their infancy to be frighted with that name. However you think I have good reaſon to make honourable mention of them, becauſe *they were*, ſay you, *the hammerers and forgers of Popery*. Alas Sir, I ſee that anger ſpoils your memory; for in the twelfth and thirteenth chapter of that very book of your *Animadverſions*, you make *Popery* to be hammered and forged not a few hundred of years, before any *ſchoolmen* were extant. You check me alſo for ſaying, that reformation of religion is pretended by emulous Plebeians, *as though*, ſay you, *Hezekiah, Joſiah, and other good Kings and Princes alſo of our own were emulous Plebeians*. But Sir, when I ſay in *Fiat Lux*, p. 20. *what glory the emulous Plebeian ſees given to higher ſpirits*, &c. I only ſpeak of the times of vulgar inſurrection againſt

against autority; as all men see except your self, who will not.

My second paragraff of the *Ground of quarrels* you like well enough, and explicate it with a text to help me out. I could not haply tell, how to cite *James*, the fourth chapter, the first and second vers of that chapter, without your help. However, it is kindnes though it be but cours, as Sir *Thomas Moor* told his maid, when she kist him as he was going to execution; and so I take it.

My third paragraff about *nullity of title*, would, you think, every period of it confute my self. But that saying of S. *Paul*, *An à vobis verbum Dei processit, an ad vos solos pervenit*, which I make use of to stop the mouths of all vitilitigatours in religion, was *cited by me*, you think, *in an unhappy hour; becaus*, say you, *ther is not any one single text of scripture more fatal to papal pretensions.* And why so Sir? *Becaus* the Gospel you say, *came to Rome* as well as it came to us here in *England*. And this is all you say, to prove that text to be so fatal to papal pretensions. To this Sir I have already told you, that it came not to us as it came to *Rome*: and now I tell you again, that it came to us from *Rome*, and not to *Rome* from us. And therfor is that text fatal to us, not to them: It may open their mouths, but I am sure it stops ours.

Heats and resolutions, the subject of my fourth

paragraff, which your ſelf will not countenance, you will not permit me to diſlike. You may talk againſt them, and I may not. But I may be excuſed; for I knew not then, ſuch a man of art as your ſelf, would ſpeak of that he underſtood better then I do.

The *motives of moderation* in my fixt paragraff you laugh at; and I will not ſtop your merriment. But in all this ſay you *Fiat Lux hath a ſecret deſign*, which your eagle-ſighted eye has diſcovered. And *in vain is the net ſpread before the eyes of a thing that hath a wing.* And I muſt know, that the authour of *Animadverſions*, is that thing that hath a wing.

6 ch. from page 148. to 177.

Your ſixt chapter, which meets juſt with my fixt paragraff of the *Obſcurity of God*, in the beginning, where you declare the ſufficient knowledg we have of God by divine revelation, whereunto by our humble beleef we have ſubſcribed our conſent, is right and good; but not at all againſt me, who there treat a caſe of metaphyſical concernment, which you apprehend not. It is no wonder then, you ſhould ſo much diſlike all that my plea of uncertainty, not only before any teacher appear, but after too; whiles you take the teacher and his words as they walk hand in hand actually linkt together with our beleef in him; which actual beleef my ſuppoſition ſuſpends and ſeparates, to the end I may conſider

ſider whether any ſuch teacher can appear ſo accompliſht as to move us, who live in this preſent age, and coin religion anew, to a beleef invariable: ſo that through your too much haſte, you utterly miſtake all my whole diſcours, and ſpeak nothing at all to the caſe I treat of. I ſpeak wholly there, as in other parts of *Fiat Lux*, upon a ſuppoſition of the condition, the generality of people are now actually in, here in *England*, where every one lets himſelf looſe at pleaſure to frame opinions and religions of themſelvs. And ſo cannot be thought to ſpeak of a ſettled beleef, but only of ſettling one, or one to be ſettled; which there and elswhere in that book, I endeavour to ſhow impoſſible to be ſo fixedly ſtated by any private man, but that himſelf and others may rationally doubt it. And that therfor our only way is to beleev and not diſpute, to ſubmit to the old way we have formerly received, and not to furniſe a new. This is the very ſubſtance, ſcope and purpos not only of that paragraff, but of my whole book, which you do as utterly ſwerve from, as ever any blinded man, put to thraſh a cock, miſplaced his blow. Perhaps it is hard for you to conceiv your ſelf in a ſtate you are not actually in at preſent: And if you cannot do this, you will be abſolutely unfit to deal with ſuch hypothetik diſcourſes, as I ſee indeed you are. *Bellarmine* litttle *catechiſe* had been a fitter book for you

to write *Animadversions* upon, than my *Fiat Lux*. There is good positive doctrin, signed *hic & nunc*, and specified to your inclination and capacity. I meddle not with any; I deliver no positive doctrin at all; I never descend to any particular conclusion or *thesis* of faith; I defend no opinion but only this, *That every opinion is defensible, and yet none impregnable.* Do you not blush Sir, to see your own gross mistake. God is my witnes, when I finde you, misled by your own errour, so furiously to tax me with ignorance, fraud, blasphemy, atheisme, I cannot but pitty you. And generally you talk at random, as well in this chapter as others. Let me give som little hint of it in particular, for this once.

Where I in my foresaid paragraff say, that *differences of faith in its branches are apt to infer a suspition in its very root, and consequently atheism.* To this you reply, that *That discours of mine is all rotten*: that *Christian religion it self might thus be questioned*: that *it is the argument of the Pagan Celsus*: that *such contests have ever been*: that *Protestants are resolved*: that *Catholiks turn atheists as well as others*: that *our religion is the same yesterday and to day*: that *our evils are from our selves*, &c. Doth this talk concern or plead to my assertion? I know all this, as well as you, but that it is nothing to the purpos, that I know, and you it seems do not. Though all this

you

you say be true, yet still it remains notwithstanding as true and certain as it was before, and that is certain enough, That difference of faith in its branches are apt to infer a suspicion in its very root, and consequently atheism. You have but beaten the air.

So likewise unto all that discours of mine, *If the Papist or Roman Catholik, who first brought us the news of our Christianity, be now becom so odious, then may likewise the whole story of our Christianity be at length thought a Romance.* You speak with the like extravagancy, and mind not my hypothetick at all, to speak directly to my inference, as it became a man of art to do. But neglecting my consequence, which in that discours is principally and solely intended, you seem to deny my supposition, which, if my discours had been drawn into a syllogism, would have been the minor part of it. And it consists of two categories, first, that the *Papist is now becom odious*: second, that the *Papist delivered us the first news of Christianity.* The first of these you little heed, the second you deny; *That the Papist*, say you, *or Roman Catholik first brought Christ and his Christianity into this land is most untrue, I wonder*, &c. And your reason is, because *if any Romans came hither, they were not Papists, and indeed our Christianity came from the East* [namely *by Joseph of Arimathea*, &c. And this is all you say to my hypothetick or conditional ratiocina-

tion; as if I had said nothing at all but that one absolute category, which being delivered before, I now only suppose. You use to call me a civil logician, but I fear a natural one as you are, will hardly be able to justifie this motion of yours as artificial. A conditional hath a verity of its own, so far differing from the supposed category, that this being fals that may yet be true. For example, if I should say thus: A man who hath wings as an eagle, or if a man had wings as an eagle, he might fly in the air, as well as another bird. Such an assertion is not to be confuted by proving that a man hath not the wings of an eagle. Yet so you deal with me here, a great master of arts with a civil logician. But, that I may go along with you; we had not Sir our Christianity immediately from the East, nor from *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, as I have already told you, we Englishmen had not. For as he delivered his Christianity to som Brittons, when our land was not called *England* but *Albion*, or *Brittany*, and the inhabitants were not Englishmen but Brittons or Kimbrians, so likewise did that Christianity and the whole news of it quite vanish, being sodainly overwhelmed by the ancient deluge of paganisme: nor did it ever come from them to us. Nay, the Brittons themselvs had so forgot and lost it, that even they also needed a second conversion, which they received from Pope *Eleutherius*. And that was

the

the onely news of Christianity which prevailed and lasted even amongst the very Brittans: which seems to me a great secret of divine providence in planting and governing his Church; as if he would have nothing to stand firm and lasting, but what was immediately fixed and seated upon that rock. For all other conversions have vanisht, and the very seats of the other Apostles failed, that all might the better cement in an unity of one head. Nay the tables which God made with his own hand were broken, but the other framed by *Moses* remained, that we might learn to give a due respect to him whom God hath set over us as our head and ruler under him, and none exalt himself against him. I know you will laugh at this my observation, but I cannot but tell you what I think. To return then to my former discours; when I speak good Sir, of the news of Christianity first brought to this land, I mean not that which was first brought upon the earth or soil of this land, and spoken to any body then dwelling here; but which was delivered to the fore-fathers of the now present inhabitants, who be Saxes or Englishmen. And I say that we, the now present inhabitants of *England*, off-spring of the English or Saxons, had the first news of our Christianity immediately from *Rome*, and from Pope *Gregorius* the Roman Patriarch, by the hands of his missioner St. *Austin*. And this

all

all men know to be as true, as they know that Papists are now becom odious. Sith then the categorick assertions are both clear; namely, that the Papist first brought us the news of Christianity; and secondly, that the Papist is now becom odious amongst us; what say you to my consequence? that the whole story of Christianity may as well be deemed a Romance, as any part of that Christianity we at first received, as now judged to be part of a Romance. This consequence of mine it behoved a man of those great parts you would be thought to have, to heed attentively; and yet you never mind it.

You adde in the close of your discours, that *many things delivered us at first with the first news of Christianity may be afterwards rejeited for the love of Christ, and by the commission of Christ?* But Sir, what love of Christ dictates, what commission of Christ allows you, to choos and reject at your own pleasure? what heretick was ever so much a fool, as not to pretend the love of Christ, and commission of Christ for what he did? How shall any one know you do it, out of any such either love or commission? sith those, who delivered the articles of faith now rejected, pretended equal love of Christ and commission of Christ, for the delivery of them, as of any other. And why may we not at length reject all the rest, for love of something els?

when

when this love of Christ, which is now crept out into the very outside of our lips, is slipt off thence. Do you think men cannot finde a cavil against him, as well as his law delivered unto us with the first news of him? and as easily dig up the root, as cut up the branches? Is not the thing already don, and many becom atheists upon that account? Pray speak to me something of reason. Did not the Jews by pretens of their love to that immortal God, whom their forefathers served, reject the whole Gospel at once? and why may not we possibly as well do it by peece-meals! Let us leav cavils: Grant my supposition which you know you cannot deny: then speak to my consequence, which I deem most strong and good, to infer a conclusion which neither you nor I can grant. I tell you plainly and without tergiversation, before God and all his holy angels, what I should think, if I descended unto any conclusion in this affair. And it is this: either the Papist, who holds at this day all those articles of faith which were delivered at the first conversion of this land by St. *Austin*, is unjustly becom odious amongst us; or els my honest Parsons throw off your cassocks, and resign your benefices and glebe-lands into the hands of your neighbours, whose they were aforetime: my consequence is irrefragable.

If any part, much more if many parts, great sub-

ſubſtantial parts of religion brought into the land with the firſt news of Chriſtianity, be once rejected (as they are now amongſt us) as Romiſh or Romancical, and that rejection or reformation be permitted, then may other parts and all parts, if the gap be not ſtopt, be lookt upon at length as points of no better a condition. Nay it muſt needs be ſo: for the ſame way and means that lopt off ſom branches, will do the like to others, and root too: A villification of that Church, wherein they find themſelvs, who have a minde to prevaricate, upon pretens of Scritur and power of interpreting, light, ſpirit, or reaſon, adjoyned with a perſonal obſtinacy that will not ſubmit, will do it roundly and to effect. This firſt brought off the Proteſtants from the Roman catholik Church; this lately ſeparated the Presbyterian from the Engliſh Proteſtant Church, the Independent from the Presbyterian, the Quaker from other Independents. And this laſt good man heeds nothing of Chriſtian religion but only the moral part, which in deed and truth is but honeſt paganiſme. This ſpeech is worthy of all ſerious conſideration. And I could wiſh you would ponder it ſeriouſly. See if the *Quaker* deny not as reſolutely the regenerating power of baptiſm, as you the efficacy of abſolution. See if the *Presbyterian* do not with as much reaſon evacuate the prelacy of Proteſtants, as they the Papacy. See if the *Socinian* argu-

arguments againſt the Trinity, be not as ſtrong as yours againſt the real preſence in the Euchariſt. See if the Jew do not with as much plauſibility deride Chriſt, as you his Church. See if *Porphiry*, *Julian*, and other ancient pagans, do not as ſtrongly confute all Chriſtianity, as we any part of it. He is a fool, that having a will and power enough, cannot find out as plauſible a pretence for the pulling down of Churches, as we had any for the deſtroying of Monaſteries. Ther be books lately ſet forth, and by more then one authour here in this land, which do as powerfully diſſipate the conceit we once had of hell, as any ever did elude Purgatory. Did we not lately find out texts and reaſonings againſt our King and monarchy, as many as we found out long ago againſt Pope and popery? Gods providence and our ſouls immortality if any liſt to deny, he may have more abundant argumentations every where occurring, than any other piece of popery now rejected ever felt. If one text of ſcriptur be by a trope of rhetorick made to ſpeak a ſens, contrarty to what was beleeved in catholik times in any one point, cannot another text by ſome ſuch ſlight be forced to fruſtrate another. I am ſure it may do ſo, and has done ſo. And thus when all articles are at laſt by ſuch tricks of wit caſhiered, can there be wanting ſeveral appearing incongruities, contradictions, tautologies, improbabilities, to diſ-

able

able all holy writ at once. And cannot the Jew afford us at last arguments enough, to dissipate at length the very name of Christ out of the world, which after the whole extirpation of his law, will but float on mens lips like an empty shadow, till it quite vanish. These things Sir, are not only true, but clear and evident. And nothing is wanting to justifie them, but a serious consideration.

These few words Sir, which I have bestowed upon you by way of supererogation, above what I needed, will somwhat inlighten you to discern the goodnes and necessity of my consequence. *If the Papist who first brought us the news of Christianity be now becom odious, then may all Christianity at length be thought a Romance,* &c. Religion like a hous, if a breach be once made and not repaired to former unity, will by degrees all moulder away, till no one room be left intire.

7 ch. from page 177. *to* 188.

Your seventh chapter finished in five leafs, runs, or flies over two or three of my paragraffs at once, which make up above fifty pages, concerning the obscurity of *Nature* and *Providence*. All which discours of mine is, you say, *nothing to my purpos*, but foisted in for *a blinde to entertain my readers*. But Sir, those judicious readers you lately left behind you, who discern my purpos better than I see you do, will tell you, that

that it is so much to my purpos, that nothing could be more. At least you let all pass without either censure or commendation, till you meet happily at length with a word or two of mine (let fall in my ninth paragraff called *Help*) about *scripture*. This makes your heart leap; it is a common place you know how to sport in, and you never meet with that sound, but it makes you dance. Your chapter then, which is written against all my philosophical discours of *nature* and *providence*, is called *scripture vindicated*, as though I had industriously wrote against scripture. And therin you sweetly dilate upon the excellency and goodnes of the word of God, as if I had any way diminished it, or wrote against it; just according to the tone of our late dismal times, *Lord, I am for thy cause Lord, I am left alone to plead thy cause Lord against thine enemies*. But Sir, the few words I there speak, only incidentally, in the end of that my paragraff called *Help*, concerning the surmises that men have about scriptur, as they be but a small part of the many, which I know to be now vented up and down the land in this our present state of separation one from another; so if I had not given som touch of them in that metaphysick abstracted discours of *Fiat Lux*, which proceeds, as I have said upon a supposition of our chusing and making religions here in *England* at pleasur, unto endles differences and divisions, it had been a

maimed

maimed and imperfect work, and no wayes satisfactory unto those judicious readers unto whom I write, though you do not. And I cannot but tell you, whatsoever you think of your self, you are in truth, except you dissemble and mistake on purpos, but a weak man, to take that as spoken absolutely by me, and by way of positive doctrin, which I only deliver upon an *hypothesis* apparent to all the world besides your self. You would make a mad commentatour upon *Solomons Ecclesiastes*. I speak upon a supposition of doubting, which these times have brought upon us, of interpreting, accepting, rejecting, framing, forging religions and opinions to our selves; and you reply against me words and discourses that presuppose an assent of beleeving. If a man beleev, he cannot doubt. And if he doubt not of the scriptures truth, he cannot make exceptions against any of its properties. But if any begin to question this or that, or other part of doctrin contained in scriptur, and delivered by those who first brought it, as every one does who swerves from the Church he found himself in; then I suppose such a one doubts. And being now thereby separated from that body of beleevers to which he before by faith adhered, he cannot now left to himself, but proceed, if he give attendance to the conduct of his own surmising thoughts, to more suspicions then I was willing to express.

But

But Sir, what you say here, and so often up and down your book, of Papists contempt of scriptur, I beseech you will please to abstain from it for the time to com: I have conversed with the Roman catholiks of *France, Flanders,* and *Germany*; I have read more of their books, both histories, contemplatives, and scholastick divines, than I believ you have ever seen or heard of. I have seen the devotion both of common people, colledges of sacred priests, and religious houses, I have communed with all sorts of people, and perused their councels. And after all this, I tell you, and out of my love I tell you, that their respect to scriptur is real, absolute and cordial even to admiration. Others may talk of it, but they act it, and would be ready to stone that man that should diminish holy writ. Let us not wrong the innocent. The scriptur is theirs, and Jesus Christ is theirs, who also will plead their caus when he sees time.

8 *ch. from page* 188 *to* 198.

In your eight chapter, which falls upon my paragraff of *Reason*, you are absolutely in a wood, and wonder more then ordinary, how *that discours of mine, concerning reason to be excluded from the imploiment of framing articles of religion, can any wayes concern* Protestants, *or be a confutation of* Protestants. As though *Fiat Lux* were written to any such concernment against Protestants. Your head is so full, it seems of that con-

troverting faculty for *Proteſtants* againſt *Papiſts*, that if *Popery* be but mentioned in a book without an epithet of deteſtation, you conclude preſently, that the book is written for Popery againſt Proteſtants. And if every thing therin contained, anſwer not the idea of your brain, then it is impertinent with you, it is filly, it is beſides the purpos. And this cenſur you have given, ſtill as you have gone along all my whole book hitherto, of every part and parcel of it, even from my preface to this preſent paragraff of *Reaſon*. You cannot ſee how all that vain flouriſhing diſcours of mine, concerning diverſity of feuds, ground of quarrels, nullity of title, heats and reſolution, motives to moderation, obſcurity of God, natur and providence, or the like, *ſhould confute Proteſtancy, or any way concern Proteſtants. And therfor it is wholly impertinent.* Thus the famous Knight, when he had once conceived an idea of his own errantry, every flock of ſheep muſt be an army, and every wind-mill a giant, or els it is impertinent to *Don Quixot*.

9 ch. from page 198 *to* 213.

Your ninth chapter upon my paragraff of *Light and Spirit*; is wholly ſpent, neglecting all my other diſcours, in ſolving *the Jewiſh objection*, which I anſwer my ſelf. And if you have added any thing better than mine, I ſhall be thankful for it as ſoon as I ſee it. But I fear your vaunting flouriſhes about ſcriptur which you love to talk

talk on, will not without the help of your *Credo* and humble resignation, solve the argument; which that you may the easlier be quit of, you never examin; but only run on in your usual flourishes about the *use and excellency* of *Gods word*. I told you in *Fiat Lux*, what the Jew will reply to all such reasonings, but you have the pregnant wit not to heed any thing that may hinder your flourishes. But Sir, if you were kept up in a chamber with a learned Jew, without bread water and fire, till you had satisfied him in that objection; I am still well enough assured, for all your aery vaunts, that if you do not make use of your *Credo*, which here you contemn, you might there stay till hunger and cold had made an end of you. But I believ you love not such dry blows; however you may be delighted with pen encounters at a distance, where after your *suppositum* has been well inspired with the warm spirits blown hither out of the fortunate islands, you may cavil revile and threaten at your pleasure, and knock down the shadow of your adversary which your own spirits have raised up, and presented to you in your chamber.

10 *th. from page* 213 *to* 228.

Your tenth chapter runs over two of my paragraffs, which speak the plea of *Independents*, *Presbyterians*, and *Protestants*. That you esteem idle, the other senseles, the last insufficient. And to make this last good, you endeavour to disable

both what I have set down to make against the prelate Protestant, and also what I have said for him. I said in *Fiat Lux*, that it made not a little against our Protestants, that after the prelate Protestancy was settled in *England*, they were forced for their own preservation against Puritans, to take up som of those principles again, which former Protestants had cast down for Popish, as is the *autority* of a visible Church, efficacy of *ordination*, difference between *clergy* and *laiety*, &c. Here first you deny *that those principles are popish*. But Sir, ther be som Jews even at this day, who will deny any such man as *Pontius Pilate*, to have ever been in *Jury*. I have other things to do, than to fill volums with useles texts, which here I might easily do, out of the books both of the first reformers, and catholik divines and councels. Then secondly you challenge me *to prove, that those principles were ever denied by our prelate Protestants*. And this you do wittily and like your self. You therfor bid me prove that those principles were ever denied by our prelate Protestants, becaus I say, that our prelate Protestants here in *England*, as soon as they became such, took up again those forenamed principles, which Protestants their forefathers both here in *England* and beyond the seas, before our prelacy was set up, had still rejected. When I say then, that our prelate Protestant affirmed and asserted those principles which former

mer Protestants denied, you bid me prove that our prelate Protestant ever denied them.

Thus you contradict what I say is pleaded against our prelate Protestant. And again you do as stiffly gain-say what I plead for him my self. You laugh at me even with head and shoulders, and tell me, *that the prelate-Protestant has far better arguments for themselvs, then either mine is, or any I can bring; nor do they need the help of such a weak logician as my self, in this their caus.* Sir give me leav to tell you here once for all, that I thought it sufficient for my design, to set down either for Papist or Protestant, when occasion required, such reasons as appeared plausible to my self, and to say all for them that can be said, was neither the work of my small ability, nor any purpos of my design. And it is enough to me, that I know no better. But let us see what my argument is, and how you crush it.

The Church, say I, *must have a bishop, or otherwise she will not have such a visible head, as she had at first*, &c. This that you may evacuate, you tell me, that *the Church hath still the same head she had, which is Christ, who is present with his Church by his Spirit and laws, and is man-God still as much as ever he was, and ever the same will be: and if I would have any other visible bishop to be that head, then it seems I would not have the same head, and so would have the same and yet not the same.* Thus you speak.

But Sir, I cannot in any reason be thought to speak otherwise, if we would use the logick, of the identity of the head, than I do of the identity of the body of the Church. This body is not numerically the same: for the men of the first age are long ago gone out of the world, and another generation come, who yet are a body of Christians of the same kind; becaus they adhere to the same principles of faith. And as the body is of the same kind, though not numerically the same, so do I require, that since Jesus Christ as man, the head immediate of other beleeving men, is departed hence to the glory of his Father, that the Church should still have a head of the same kind, as visibly now present, as she had in the begitining, or els say I, she cannot be completely the same body, or a body of the same kind she was. But this she hath not; this she is not, except she have a visible bishop, as she had in the beginning, present with her, guiding and ruling under God. Christ our Lord is indeed still man-God, but this man-hood is now separate; nor is he visibly now present as man, which immediately headed his beleevers under God, on whose influence that natur depended. His God-head is still the same in all things, not only in it self, but in order also to his Church, as it was before, equally invisible, and in the like manner beleeved; but the natur delegate under God, and once ruling visibly amongst us by words and examples,

examples, is now utterly withdrawn. And if a natur of the same kind, be not now delegate with a power of exteriour government, as at the first ther was, then hath not the Church the same head now, which she had then, nor is she the same polity or body she was before: *Qui habet aures audiendi audiat.*

And here by the way we may take notice what a sincere English Protestant you are, who labour so stoutly to evacuate my argument for episcopacy, and leav none of your own behind you, nor acquaint the world with any, although *you know far better*; but would make us beleev notwithstanding those far better reasons for prelacy, that Christ himself, as he is the immediate and only head of the invisible influence, so is he likewise the only and immediate head of visible direction and government among us, without the interposition of any person delegate in his stead, to oversee and rule under him in his Church on earth: which is against the tenour both of sacred gospel, and S. *Pauls* epistles, and all antiquity, and the present ecclesiastick polity of *England*; and is the doctrin not of any English Protestant, but of the Presbyterian, Independent, and Quaker.

Christ then in your way is immediate head not only of submiristration and influence, but of exterior direction and government to his Church. Pray tell me, is he such an immediate

head to all beleevers, or no? if he be to all, then is no man to be governed in affairs of religion by any other man; and Presbyterian Ministers are as needless, as either Catholik or Protestant byshops. On the other side, if he be not immediate head to all, but ministers head the people, and Christ heads the ministers, this in effect is nothing els, but to make every minister a byshop. Why do you not plainly say, what it is more than manifest you would have. All this while you heed no more the laws of the land, than constitutions of gospel.

As for gospel; That Lord, who had been visible governour and pastour of his flock on earth, when he was now to depart hence, as all the apostles expected one to be chosen to succeed him in his care, so did he, notwithstanding his own invisible presence and providence over his flock, publikly appoint one. And when he taught them, that he who were greatest among them should be as the least, he did not deny but suppose one greater, and taught in one and the same breath, both that he was over them, and for what he was over them, namely to feed, not to tyrannize, not to domineer, abuse, and hurt, but to direct, comfort, and conduct his flock, in all humility and tendernes, as the servant of all their spiritual necessities. And if a byshop be otherwise affected, it is the fault of his person, not his place.

As

As for the laws of the land, it is there most strongly decreed by the consent and autority of the whole Kingdom, not only that byshops are over ministers, but that the Kings majesty is head of byshops also in the line of hierarchy, from whose hand they receiv both their place and jurisdiction. This was establisht not onely by one, but several acts and constitutions, both in the reign of King *Edward* and Queen *Elizabeth*. So that by the laws of the land ther be two greeces between ministers and Christ, which you cut off, to the end you may secretly usurp the autority and place of both, to the overthrow at once both of gospel and our law too.

By the laws of our land our series of ecclesiastical government stands thus.	God Christ King Byshop Ministers People	the Presbyterian predicament is this,	God Christ Minister People.

So that the Ministers head in the Presbyterian predicament, touches Christs feet immediately, and nothing intervenes. You pretend indeed, that hereby you do exalt Christ; but this is a meer cheat, as all men may see with their eyes; for Christ is but where he was; but the minister indeed is exalted, being now set in the Kings place, one degree higher than the byshops, who by the law is under both King and byshop too.

You

You will here say to me, *What is the Papists line of Church government. There the Pope must sit next Christ, and Kings under his feet.* Sir, I have not time in this short letter to discours this subject as it deserves. Nor does it now concern me, who have no more here to say than only this; that my argument for prelacy, howsoever in your words you may disable it, is not weakned by you in deeds at all, and as far as I can perceiv, not understood. Yet two things I shall tell you over and above what I need in this affair also.

First is, that Roman catholiks do more truly and cordially acknowledg the respective Christian King of any Kingdom to be supream head of his catholik subjects even in affairs of religion, than any other, whether Independents, Presbyterians, or even prelate Protestants have, if we speak of truth and reality, ever done. And this I could easily make good both by the laws and practises of all catholik kingdoms upon earth in any age on one side, and the opposite practises of all Protestants on the other. Second is, that for what reasons Roman catholiks deny a prince to be head of the Church, for the same ought all others as they deny it in deeds, so, if they would speak sincerely as they think and act, to deny it in words also as well as they. For catholiks do beleev him to be head of the Church, from whom the channel of religion

and

and all direction in it is derived and flows; for which reason a spring is said to be head of a river. But neither does any King upon earth, except he be priest and prophet too, ever trouble himself to derive religion, as the Pope has ever don: neither does either Protestant, Presbyterian or Independent, either in *England* or elswhere, ever seek for religion from the lips of the king, or supplicate unto him when any doubt arises in those affairs, as they ought in conscience and honesty to do, for a final decision, any more than the Roman catholik does. So that whatever any of them may say, all Protestants do as much deny the thing in their behaviour, as catholiks do in words; and catholiks do in their behaviour observ as much, as Protestants either practise or pretend. What is the reason that Roman catholiks in all occurring difficulties of faith, both have their recours unto their papal Pastour, (unto whom Kings themselvs remit them) and acquiesce also to his decision and judgment, but only becaus they believ him to be head of the Church. And if Protestants have no such recours, nor will not acquiesce to his Majesties autority in affairs of religion, but proceed to wars and quarrels without end, the prince neglected as wholly unconcerned in those resolvs, they do as manifestly deny his headship, as if they profest none. Nay, to acknowledg a headship in words, and deny it in deeds, is but mockery.

mockery. By these two words Sir, it may appear, that the Kings majesty is as much head of the Church to Roman Catholiks as to any Protestants, and these no more than they either derive religion or decision of their doubts from the kings chair,

Ith interim it is a shame and general scandal to the whole world, that we in *England* should neither supplicate nor acquiesce in affairs of religion to his Majesties judgment, whom in words we acknowledg head of the Church, but fight and quarrel without end; and yet have the confidence to upbraid Roman catholiks with a contrary beleef, who although they ever looked upon their papal patriarch as spiritual head and pastour and deriver of their faith, unto whom they so submit, that he who after his decision remains contumacious, forfeits his Christianity, yet have they notwithstanding in all ages and kingdoms resigned with a most ready cordial reverence unto all decisions, orders and acts of their temporal princes even in spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs, as well as civil, so far as their laws reached, as supreme head and governours of their respective kingdoms. And all kings and princes find in a very short space, however others may utter hypocritical words of flattery, that indeed none but catholik subjects do heed and fear and observ them universally, in all whatever their commands, being

taught

taught by their religion, of which they alone give account at times appointed for penance, to hearken and obey for conſcience ſake all higher powers, conſtituted over them for good.

That catholiks do univerſally obſerv their King in all affairs as well eccleſiaſtick as civil, I need not, to make it good, ſend you Sir either to the teſtimonies of civil law and *Codex* of *Juſtinian*, or the other various conſtitutions of ſo many ſeveral provinces and kingdoms, as are and have been in Chriſtendom, our own home will ſuffice to juſtifie it. Were not the ſpiritual courts, both court Chriſtian, Prerogative court and Chancery, all ſet up in catholik times, about matters of religion, and affairs of conſcience, and all mannaged by clerks or clergy-men under the King? In brief, where ever any civil coaction or coactive power intervenes, be it in what affair it will, all ſuch power and action who ever uſes it, hath it autoritatively only from the King. For neither Pope, nor Byſhop, nor any Prieſt ought to be a ſtriker, as *S. Paul* teaches: nor have they any lands, or livings, or court, or power to compel or puniſh either in goods or body, but what is lent or given by princes and princely men, out of their love and reſpect to Jeſus Chriſt and his holy goſpel, whoſe news they firſt conveighed about the world; although a juſt donation is, I ſhould think, as good a tickle,

as either emption, inheritance, or conqueſt, if it be irrevocable. The King is the only ſtriker in the land *ex jure*, and the ſword of the almighty is only in his hand; and none can compel or puniſh either in body or goods, but only himſelf, or others by his commiſſion, in any whatever affair. He can either by his autority and laws blunt the ſword of thoſe who have one in their hand, whether by pact or nature, as have maſters over ſervants, and parents over children; or put a civil power into the hands of thoſe who otherwiſe have none, as prelates, prieſts, and byſhops. So that although the Pope derive religion, and chiefly direct in it, yet is the King the only head of all civil coercition, as well in Church affairs as any other, which his commands and laws do reach unto.

So that the line of Church government amongſt catholiks, ſince the converſion of kings, runs in two ſtreams; the one is of direction, the other of coercition. That of direction is from Chriſt to the chief paſtour, from him to patriarchs, then to metropolitans, arch-byſhops, byſhops, prieſts, and people: and in this line is no corporal coaction at all, except it be borrowed; nor any other power to puniſh, but only by debarring men from ſacraments. In the other line of corporal power and autority the King is immediately under God the Almighty, from whom he receivs the ſword to keep and defend

defend the dictates of truth and justice, as supream governour, though himself for direction and faith be subject to the Church from whose hands he received it, as well as other people his subjects; after the King succeed his princes and governours in order, with that portion of power all of them, which they have from him their leige sovereign received. This in brief of papal Church government, which we in *England* by our canting talk of the Lord Christ, to the end we may be all lords and all Christs, have utterly subverted.

Indeed in primitive times the channel of religion for three hundred years ran apart, and separate from civil government which in those dayes persecuted it. And then the line of Christian government was unmixt. None but priests guided, defended, governed the Church and Christian flock; which they did by the power of their faith, vertue, secret strength, and courage in Jesus their Lord invisible. Afterward it pleased the God of mercies, to move the hearts of emperours and kings of the earth, to submit unto a participation of grace; which they were more easily inclined by the innocence and sanctity of Christian faith, especially in that particular of peaceful obedience unto kings and rulers, though aliens, and pagans, and persecutors of religion. And now kings being made Christian were looked upon by their subjects with a double

ble reverence, more loved, more feared, more honoured than before. Nor could Christian people now tell how to expres that ineffable respect they bore their Kings, now co-heirs of heaven, with them, whom before in their very paganism they were taught by their priests to observ as gods upon earth, not for wrath only or fear of punishment, but for conscience also, and danger of hazarding not only their temporal contents, but their eternal salvation also, for their resisting autority though resident in pagans. And Kings on the other side, who aforetime by the counsel of worldly senatours enacted laws, such as they thought fit for present policy, and defended them by the sword of justice, wielden under God to the terrour of evil doers and defence of the innocent, began now, as was incumbent on their duty, to use that sword for the protection of Christianity, and faith, and the better way now chalked out unto them by Christian priests, from Jesus the wisdom and Son of God. And by the direction of the same holy prelates, abbots, and other priests, who were now admitted with other senators into counsel, did they in all places enact speciall and particular laws answerable to the genetal rule of faith, which they found to be more excellent and perfect, than any judgment they had by natural reason hitherto discovered.

Thus

Thus poor Christians, who had hitherto but only a head of *derivation*, of counsel and direction, which could but only bid them have patience for Christs sake, and conform themselvs to his meek passion, when they suffered from aliens, and when they suffered injury from one another, could only debar the evil doer, if he gave not satisfaction, from further use of sacraments; those Christians I say, who could hitherto have no other comfort or assistance in this world under their spiritual pastour, than what words of piety could afford, had now by the grace of heaven princely protectours, royal defenders, and head champions under God, to vindicate and make good all Christian rights, discipline, and truths now accepted and established from faith, as well as other civil rites and customs dictated aforetime from meer reason, equally revengers upon all evil doers indifferently, that were found criminal in affairs, as well purely Christian as civil, still using the advice and direction of their prelates and Christian peers in the framing and establishing of all those laws they were now resolved to maintain. So it was don in *England*; so in all places of the Christian world. And then the line of Christian government ran mixt, which before was single. And Christians now had a *Joshua* to their *Aaron*, who were only led by *Moyses* before. And although *Aaron* was head of the Church, yet

Joshua was head and leader, prince and captain of all those people who were of that Church. The chief bishop is an *Aaron*, and every Christian king a *Joshua*. And as it is a content and support to *Aaron* to have a *Joshua* with him, to fight Gods battles, and keep the people in awe; so is it not a little comfort to *Joshua* to have an *Aaron* by him, with whom he may consult. And indeed no kingdom can have a perfect accomplishment without the presence of these two swords, civil and spiritual. *Ecce duo gladij hic! satis est.*

And although Christians even at this day, when any heresy or novelty arises, have still recours unto the same head of their religion for a decision of the doubt, whom they consulted before, (for as the channel of Christianity is and must be still the same, so must the spring-head be the same also) yet when the thing is once decided, they have none but kings and governours under him, to see the direction executed, as the only overseers with coactive power to do it.

And thus you see in brief how the Pope is head of the Church, and the King head likewise, and both immediately under God; but with this difference, that the king only governs Christianity established in his own royalty by law; the Pope without further law rules and guides all the streams and rivulets of religion, where ever it flows. He is head of primary direction; the

king

king of sovereign execution: he of guidance and spiritual autority only; the king of civil and natural power invested in his place and dignity from God above, to maintain any laws as well purely Christian as civil, which himself shall accept, establish, and promulgate. The Pope perswades, but the King commands: and although the Pope should formally command, yet vertually and in effect such a command amounts only to a perswasion, and he that obeys not, feels no smart for it, except the king be pleased to espous his caus, and punish the contumacious; which if he justly do, then have kings a just autority in those affairs, if otherwise, then hath the Pope no means of help or defence in this world, any more after the conversion of kings than before it; and help himself he cannot any other way, than only by putting people out of his communion, who care not for it. The Pope is obeyed for conscience and love only to his religion, the King for wrath and conscience too: the Pope delivers the rule but in general only, and blunt on one side; the King particularises it, and gives it an edg: the Popes headship is exercised in *Ought* and *Should be*, the Kings is *Will and shall be*: the Pope directs, but the King compells: the Pope secludes the contumacious from heaven, which he that beleevs not feels not; the King over and above that, cuts off malefactors

from the face of the earth too, and they shall be made by feeling to beleev it.

And these two defend and secure one another, and keep both Christians and their faith inviolate. And while Christians themselvs do both tenderly love their Pape and chief pastour, and spring-head of their religion, which is beleeved beyond him to flow invisibly from God the great ocean of truth; and withall do honor fears and observ their King and princely governour, who only bears the sword of justice, and not in vain, to take revenge upon all those, whom the love of religion and spiritual sword of their pastour will not keep in awe, they do their duty as they ought, and shall finde happines therein. I must make haste, and can say no more at present to this busines, which as I have told you is somewhat besides my purpos.

Only one thing I must needs tell you before I pass on. Although a King is in a good and proper sence stiled head as well of Church as State within his own dominions, as for all coersive power therein; yet head of the Church *absolutely*, or head of primary direction in faith, is so proper to the chief Prelate, that no man upon earth besides himself hath ever so much as pretended to it: and that for five reasons. First, becaus *head of the Church absolutely*, intimates an universal right over the guidance of religion, not in one kingdom only, but all, where ever

that

that religion is. And the King of *France*, for example, neither did nor can pretend to be head of the Church of *England*, much less of *Hungary*, *Spain*, *Africk*, *Italy*, *Greece*, *Asia*, &c. Yet such a head there must needs be, to the end the Church may be one mystick body, at unity in it self. And that head must be unlimited to time and place, as the Church it self is ever permanent, and universally spread; nor must the government alter, as governments of particular kingdoms do. Secondly, head of the Church absolutely, involves a primacy both of conveighing and interpreting faith: and all princes in *Europe* received their faith at first from priests, who sent for that end from their spiritual superiour converted their kingdoms; but they never gave faith either to them or their pastour. Thirdly, he that is head of the Church absolutely, must be of the same connatural condition with the whole hierarchy, to confirm, baptise, ordain, preach, attone the almighty by sacrifice, impose hands, segregate men from their worldly state unto his own spiritual one, and in a special manner to exercise those priestly functions, unto which he segregates them. Fourthly, head of the Church absolutely is to be indifferent unto kingdoms and all sorts of government, as the religion also is, and keep it like it self in all places unaltered in its nature, however in its general dictates it may concur to

the direction and good of all people and governments. And therefor he cannot be confined to one place or government, but must be as it were separate and in a condition indifferent to all; as a general bishop, whose sole care is to heed those eradiations of faith spread up and down the world, may be and is, when princes heed but their own particular kingdoms, and care not how religion goes in another, any more then their wealth or polity. Thus the sun-beams, though they fall upon several soils diversly affected, yet they keep their own nature unaltered, by vertue of one general fountain-head of light which is indifferent to every kingdom, and dispenses, distributes, and keeps the raies unchanged. The ends and wayes of religion are quite of another nature from all worldly businesses, and therfor require a particular superintendent set apart for them; as indeed they ever have had since the time of religions first master, who as he did educate his in order to a life eternal in a government apart, being himself a man distinct from *Cæsar*, so used he to speak of religious duties as separate and differing from others; *Reddite*, saith he, *quæ Cæsaris sunt, Cæsari, & quæ Dei, Deo.* In very truth, the Church and Christianity, as it is a thing accidental to all worldly states, so is it superinduced upon them as an influence of another rank and order, unto a particular end of future

future bliſs; whereas all ſtates do of themſelves aim no further then the peace and happines of this life. And ſo for the particular end and means anſwerable therunto, which religion uſes, it will require a particular and ſpecial overſeer. Thus *Ariſtotle*, though he conceited the celeſtial orbs to be contiguous, and ſo all rapt together in a motion from Eaſt to Weſt, yet becaus they had ſpecial motions of their own, he therfor allowed them particular intelligences to guide thoſe motions. So we ſee in ordinary affairs, a man that hath ſeveral wayes and ends is guided by ſeveral directours, in this by a lawyer, in that by a phyſician, by a gardener, by a tradeſman, &c. Fiftly, becaus head of the Church abſolutely, muſt be one that ſucceeds in his chair, whom Jeſus the maſter left and appointed perſonally to feed his flock. No King upon earth ever pretended to ſit in that Fiſhermans chair, or to ſucceed him in it, which the Pope to my knowledg for ſixteen hundred years hath both challenged as his right, and actually poſſeſt. And Catholiks are all ſo fixt in this judgment, that they can no more disbeleev it, then they can ceas to beleev in Jeſus Chriſt.

11 *ch. from page* 228. *to* 246.

Your eleventh chapter falls directly upon my fifteenth paragraff of Scriptur. And therfor I may here expect, you ſhould inſult over me to the purpos. But Sir I told you before, and now

tell you again, that I know no other rule to Christians either for faith or manners, no other hope, no other comfort, but what scriptur and holy gospel affords. But this is not any part of the debate now in hand, however you would perswade the world to think so. When four or five men Sir of several judgements collected from the very scriptur you and I talk of, rise up one against another with one and the same scriptur in their hands, with such equal pretence of light, power, and reason, that no one will either yield to another, or remain himself in the same faith, but run endles divisions without controul: does scriptur prevent this evil? does it, has it, can it remedy it? can any one man make a religion by the autority of scriptur alone, which neither himself nor any other, upon the same grounds he framed it, shall rationally doubt of. This is our case Sir, and only this; which you do not so much as take notice of, to the end you may with a more plausible rhetorick, insult over me as a contemner of Gods word. Nor do you heed any particle of my discours in this paragraff, but according to your manner, collect principles to the number of seven, out of it, you say, which I do not know to be so much as hinted in it; that as you did before, so you may now again play with your own bawble, and confute your self. And they are in a manner the very same you sported with before in your

second

second chapter. 1. *from the Romans we received the gospel.* 2. *what is spoken in scripture of the Church, belongs to the Roman.* 3. *the Roman every way the same it was,* &c. of all which I do not remember that I have in that my paragraff so much as any one word. Sir, either speak to my discours as you finde it, or els hold your peace.

As if then you had overheard me afore-hand, to give you this deserved check, at the close of your chapter, you bring in som few words of mine, with a short answer of your own, annext to the skirts of it; which I here set down as you place them your self. No man can say, speaks *Fiat Lux*, what ill popery ever did in the world, till *Henry* the eights dayes, when it was first rejected. *Strange*, say you in your Animadversions, *when it did all the evils that ever were in the Christian world.* With the Roman catholiks unity ever dwelt. *Never.* Protestants know their neighbour catholiks, not their religion. *They know both.* Protestants are beholding to Catholiks, for their benefices, books, pulpits, gospel. *For som, not all.* The Pope was once beleeved general pastour over all. *Prove it.* The scriptur and gospel we had from the Pope. *Not at all.* You cannot beleev the scriptur, but upon the autority of the Church. *We can and do.* You count them who brought the scriptur as lyars. *No otherwise.* The gospel separated from the

the Church can prove nothing. *Yes it self.* This short work you make with me. And to all that serious discours of mine concerning scripture, which takes up sixteen pages in *Fiat Lux*, we have got now in reply thereunto, this your Laconick-confutation. *Strang. Never. Know both. Som not all. Prove it. Not at all. Can and do. No otherwis. Yes it self.*

12 ch. from page 246. to 262.

Your twelfth chapter meets with my history of religion, as a flint with steel, only to strike fire. For not heeding my story which is serious, temperate, and sober, you tell another of your own, fraught with defamations and wrath, against all ages and people: and yet speak as confidently, as calm truth could do. First you say, that *Joseph of Arimathea was in England, but he taught the same religion that is in England now.* But what religion is that Sir? Then, you tell us *that the story of Fugatius and Damian missioners of Pope Eleutherius you do suspect for many reasons.* But becaus you assign none, I am therfor moved to think they may be all reduced to one, which is, that you will not acknowledg any good thing ever to have come from *Rome: Then*, say you, *succeeded times of luxury, sloth, pride, ambition, scandalous riots, and corruption both of faith and manners, over all the Christian world, both princes, priests, prelates and people.* Not a grain of vertue or any goodnes we must think,

think, in so many Christian kingdoms and ages. *Then did Goths and Vandals, and other pagans overflow the Christian world.* To teach them we may think, how to mend their manners. *These pagans took at last to Christianity.* Haply, becaus it was a more loose and wicked life, than their own pagan profession. *These men now Christened advanced the Popes autority, when Christian religion was now grown degenerate.* And now we come to know, how the Roman byshop became a patriark above the rest, by means namely of new converted pagans. It was an odde chance, they should think of advancing him to what they never knew, either himself, or any other advanced before amongst Christians, whose rotten and corrupt faith they had lately embraced. And yet more odde and strange it was, that all Christendom should calmly submit to a power, set up anew by young converted pagans; no prince or byshop either there or of any other Christian Kingdom, either then or ever after to this day excepting against it. Had not all the byshops and priests of *Africa*, *Egypt*, *Syria*, *Thrace*, *Greece*, and all the Christian world acknowledged by a hundred experiments the supreme spiritual autority of the Roman patriarch in all times, before this deluge of Goths and Vandals? But why do I expostulate with you, who write these things not to judicious readers, but fools and children, who are not more apt to tell

a truth, then beleev a ly. But what follows next. *Towards the beginning of this hurry*, say you, *were the Brittons extirpated by the Saxes, who in after-times received Austin from Rome, a man very little acquainted with the Gospel.* Here's the thanks good S. *Austin* hath, who out of his love and tendernes to our nations welfare, after so long and tedious journeys, entred upon the wild forrest of our paganisme, with great hazards and inexpressible sufferings of hunger, cold, and other corporal inconveniences, to communicate *Christ Jesus*, and his life and grace unto our nation. *After this*, say you, *religion daily more and more declined till the Reformation rose.* This is the sum of your story; which if I like not, *I may thank my self*, say you, *for putting you in minde of it.* Indeed Sir, it is so fals and defamatory, and loaden with foul language, not only against all nations, ages and people of all conditions, but against the honour of sacred gospel it self, which must utterly dye, and have no life or power in the world for so many ages together, that I think neither I, or any els can like it, that bears any respect either to religion, modesty, or truth. You say in this your chapter that *I am better at telling a tale then managing an argument*: But I shall now beleev, that you are equally good at both. Popery then is nothing but vice, and Protestancy is all vertue. I would we could see where this Protestancy dwells.

13 *ch. from page 262. to 278.*

Your thirteenth chapter takes up my three following paragraffs about the *hiſtory of religion*; wherein, after that according to your wonted manner you tell me, that I *do not my ſelf underſtand* what this thing, that thing, the other thing means, altho it be part of my own diſcours, you ſay at length, that *ther is no ſuch matter*, as I ſpeak; make another ſtory of your own of the ſame mettle with your former, impoſing afreſh upon popery (by which I do not indeed know what you mean) a wain-load of adulteries, drunkennes, atheiſme, poiſonings, avarice, pride, cruelties, tumults, blaſphemy, rebellions, wars, crimes, and yet threatning to ſay, if you ſhould chance to be provoked, far harder things then theſe. Sir, may no man provoke a waſp, nor force you to your harder things. You are a terrible man of arms.

But if this be the right character of *Popery*, which here and elswhere up and down your book you give us, I tell you firſt, it will be a difficult matter to know in what age or place *popery* moſt reigns; ſecondly, that it is a thing I am ſo far from excuſing, that I wiſh it back to the pit of hell from whence it iſſued; thirdly, that Roman catholiks, if you be indeed againſt this popery, are all on your ſide; for to my knowledg their religion is as oppoſite to it, as light to darknes, or God to Belial; laſtly, that you

you need not be so tenderly fearful for the spreading of *popery*; for honest men will be ready to stone him that teaches it, and knaves, hypocrites, adulterers, traitors, theeves, drunkards, atheists, rebels, if you have given a right description of popery, are all Papists already; these need no conversion, the other will by no rhetorick be moved to it. Indeed you fright us all from papistry. For though som love iniquity as it is gainful or pleasursom, and must needs suffer for it when they are condemned at the sessions, and cannot avoid it; yet is no man willing to suffer either loss of goods or imprisonment, death or banishment, for the bare name of popery, that hath neither good nor gain in it. In a word, wicked men will act your popery, but not own it. And they which own a popery, which I see you are not acquainted withall, will not only dislike others, but hate themselvs, if through any frailty or passion they should ever fall into any article of your *Popery* here described. Good Sir, take heed of blaspheming that innocent Catholik flock, which the Angels of God watch over to protect them. Be afraid to curs them, whom God hath blessed, or impose that upon their Religion, which it detests.

14 *ch. from page* 278. *to* 286.

Your fourteenth chapter, which is upon my title of *Discovery*, labours to show that som of the

the *contradictions*, which I mentioned in *Fiat Lux* to be put upon popery, are no *contradictions* at all; and labour may. Well Sir, although ſlanders put upon them be never ſo contradictory and oppoſite, yet muſt they have patience. All is true enough, if it be but bad enough. While our Kings reign in peace, then the Papiſts religion is perſecuted, as contrary to monarchy: when we have deſtroyed that government, then is the papiſt haraſſed, ſpoiled, pillaged, murdered, becaus their religion is wholly addicted to monarchy, and papiſts are all for Kings. Have not theſe things been done over and over, within the ſpace of a few years here lately in *England*? All men now alive have been eye-witneſſes of it, Theſe things as put upon papiſts ceas to be contradictions: And if they ſhould be contradictions, both parts are therfor true in our countrey logick, becaus they are put upon papiſts. Is there not ſomething of the power of darknes in this?

One latin word of mine which ſhuts up that my paragraff of *Diſcovery*. *Ejice ancillam cum puero ſuo*, becaus I engliſh it not, you tranſlate it for me, or rather interpret it, *Banniſh all men out of England but Papiſts*: this according to your gloſs muſt be my meaning. And you ſeem to exult, that *Fiat Lux*, who in outward ſhow pretends ſo much moderation, ſhould let fall a word that betrayes no little miſchief in his heart.

heart. Good Lord whither does paſſion hurry mans ſpirit! All that period of mine in the end of the foreſaid § is but meerly coppied out of one of Saint *Pauls* letters, which he wrote to the *Galatians*, the fourth chapter of that Epiſtle, wherein thoſe very words, alluding to a paſſage in *Moſes* his pentateuch, are expreſt. Do you either read in your Engliſh Bible, *Baniſh all men out of England*, or underſtand any ſuch meaning of *Ejice ancillam cum puero ſuo?* Gal. 4.30. Pray peruſe the ten laſt verſes of that chapter attentively; and ſee if I have not in my diſcours ſo coppied out their meaning and very words too, ſo far as it behooved; that I have done nothing els. *Abraham had two ſons*, ſaith St. *Paul*, *one of a handmaid*, *the other of a free woman*, &c. *Theſe things are an allegory*, &c. *But as then, he that was born after the fleſh perſecuted him that was born after the ſpirit, even ſo it is now. But what ſaith the ſcriptur? Caſt out the bondwoman with her ſon: for the ſon of the bondwoman ſhall not be heir with the ſon of the freewoman*, &c. Pray tell me ſoberly; Did the apoſtle mean by thoſe words, *Caſt out the Bond-woman with her ſon*, that the ſons of *Iſhmael* ſhould be put to the ſword, or baniſht out of their kingdom? Now pray hear my diſcours which I coppied out of that original; *If my reader here be cautious, he may eaſily diſcern a reaſon, why all theſe ſects are ſo boiſterous one againſt another, and*

every

every one of them againſt the Roman catholik. Iſmael diſturbed the whole hous, and was ever quarrelling and buſtling againſt Iſaac. The reaſon is the ſame both here and there. Iſmael was a natural ſon, and Iſaac the legitimate heir. And natural ſons be generally ſeditious, violent and clamorous. As Iſmael therfor was Iſaac his natural brothet; ſo is a Proteſtant Miniſter but the by-blow of a catholick Prieſt; the Presbyterian likewiſe to him: and ſo forward, till you com to the Quaker, who was begot by a deluſion, and brought into the world by a fright: his hand is againſt every man, and every mans hand againſt him. The remedy and only means of peace is, Ejice ancillam cum puero ſuo. Theſe be my words out of *S. Paul*; and what is his meaning, the ſame is mine. But you will have me in ſpight of my teeth, becaus I ſpeak nothing but good, ſtill to mean ſom evil. I thought *S. Paul* had meant by thoſe words, if I muſt needs diſcover my underſtanding to you, that the peaceable *Iſaats* were the only ſons of Gods promiſed love and favour, the inheritance of which bleſſing boiſterous *Iſhmaels* can never work out to themſelvs, by all their perſecutions and buſtling contentions. And according to this meaning I concluded, that to conſider and think ſeriouſly of this, were the only remedy and means of peace amongſt us here in *England. Ejice ancillam cum puero ſuo* is an antidote againſt all contentious emulations, which are a ſuſpicious

mark not of an elect, but of a reprobate. But whatever I say, I must neither think, nor mean, but what you will have me to do; and that shall still be something that is odious. An emblem hereof was the rod of *Moses*, which in *Moses* hand was a walking-staff, but out of it a serpent.

15 ch. from page 286 to 304.

In your fifteenth chapter, upon my paragraff of *Messach*, you are in a mighty plunge what this *Messach* should be, and what the *etimology* of that word. *Latin* it is not, *greek* it is not, and you are sure it is not *hebrew*; surely it is, say you, *some uncouth word, like that of the Gnosticks Paldabaoth.* Alas good Sir, it is English, a pure English word; used here in *England* all the Saxons time, and som hundred years after the conqueſt, till the French monosyllable had by little and little worn out the last syllable of the word. And you may find it yet in the old Saxon laws which I have read my self, those especially of King *Ina*, if I rightly remember the name, which be yet extant, wherin strict care and provision is made, that a due reverence be kept by all people in the Church all the time of their *Messach*, which now we call *Mess* or *Mass*.

Then having laughed at my admiration of catholik Service, you carp at me for saying that the *first Christians were never called together to hear a sermon*; and to convince me, you bring

fom places out of S. Pauls Epiſtles, and the Acts, which commend the miniſtery of the word: This indeed is your uſual way of refuting my ſpeeches; you flouriſh copiouſly in that which is not at all againſt me, and never apply it to my words, leſt it ſhould appear, as it is, impertinent. I deny not that people were by Gods word converted, or that converts were further inſtructed, or that the preaching of Gods word is good and uſeful many wayes; but that which I ſay is, that primitive Chriſtians were never called together for that end, as the great work of their Chriſtianity. This I have ſo clearly proved, both in the ſecond dialogue of the *Reclaimed Papiſt*, and alſo in the foreſaid paragraff of *Meſſach*, that you divert from that, to declaim of the neceſſity and excellency of preaching, and bring neither text nor reaſon that may reach to my words at all.

You go on, and wonder much, that *we ſhould hear nothing in ſcriptur of this Chriſtian ſacrifice, if any ſuch were.* Sir, you will neither hear nor ſee. But, ſay you, *the paſſion of our Lord is our Chriſtian ſacrifice.* Do not I ſay ſo too? But that this incruent ſacrifice was inſtituted by the ſame Lord before his death, to figur out daily before our eyes that paſſion of his, which was then approaching, in commemoration of his death, ſo long as the world ſhould laſt; this, tho I plainly ſpeak it, you take no notice of it.

But *the Judaical sacrifice*, say you, *is said by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews, in this to differ from the sacrifice of Christians, that ours was don but once, theirs often.* It is true, the sacrifice of our Lords passion, of which the apostle in that whole discours only treats, in opposition to that of bulls and goats, was so don but once, that it could not be don twice. But as the sacrifices of the old law, were instituted by almighty God, to be often iterated before the passion of the Messias for a continual exercise of religion; so did the same Lord for the very same purpos of religious exercise, institute another to be iterated after his death; unto which it were to have reference, when it should be past, as the former had to the same death, when it was to com. And it hath a reference so much the more excellent, as that it doth by the almighty power of the same Messias, exhibit to the faith of his beleevers, that very true real body as crucified amongst us, wherof the former Mosaical sacrifices gave meerly a shadow. Did not our Lord do this? Were not the apostles according to this rite λειτουργοῦντες τῷ κυρίῳ, sacrificing to our great Lord God, when S. *Paul* was by imposition of hands segregated from the laiety for his divine service, as I clearly in that my paragraff evince out of the history of the *Acts* of the apostles. *No*, say you, *the apostles were not then about any sacrifice, but only preach-*

preaching Gods word, or ſom ſuch thing to the people, in the name and behalf of God. But Sir, is this to be in earneſt or to jeſt? The ſacred text ſayes, they were ſacrificing to our Lord, liturgying, and miniſtring to him. You ſay, *They were not ſacrificing to God, but only preaching to the people.* And now the queſtion is, whether you or I more rightly underſtand that Apoſtolicall book. For my ſence and meaning I have all antiquity, as well as the plain words of ſacred text, you have neither.

16 *ch. from page* 304 *to* 313.

Your ſixteenth chapter upon my paragraff of the Virgin *Mary*, which is, you ſay, *the moſt diſingenious of all my book*, is ſpent in an *invective againſt calumnies*, which brings you upon your often iterated common place of *Pagans reproaches of Chriſtians*. And whatever my paragraff may be, this your chapter ſeems to me as ingenious as the very beſt of your book, and abſolutely frivolous. And muſt you invegh againſt calumnies, whoſe whole book is nothing els? It is a bundle of ſlanders, and a meer quiver of fiery darts of deſolation and malice.

17. *ch. from page* 313 *to* 325.

Your ſeventeenth chapter upon my paragraff of *Images* or *Figures*, nibbles at more of my diſcours made in that one paragraff, then you have taken notice of in ten of my others. A

man, say you, *may indeed have such thoughts of devotion, as Fiat Lux speaks of, upon the sight of images, which he sees hanging in Churches, if he be a man distraught of his wits, not if he be himself and sober.* So then; mad men it seems can tell what figures represent, sober and wise men cannot. Again, *The violation of an image*, say you, *redounds to the prototype, if it be rightly and duly represented, not els.* And when then is Christ crucified, for example, rightly and duly represented? Are you one of those mad men can tell what figures represent, yea or no. *The hanging up of traitors in effigie is don*, say you, *only to make a declaration of the fact, and not to cast a dishonour upon the person.* So you say: Because you know it don long after the fact has rung all the whole Kingdom over; and don, not in places of concours, but ignominy; not in the *Exchange*, but *Tyburn*; not with any characters declaring the fact, but with a halter about his neck, to denote the death and ignominy inflicted, as far as is possible, upon him. You go on.

Where the Psalmist complains of Gods enemies breaking down his sculptures, he means not thereby any images or figures, but only wainscot or carved ceiling. Surely the Prophet wanted a word then to express himself, or translatours to express the Prophet. If we must guess at his meaning without heeding his words, one might

think

think it as probable, what also holy scripture tells us, that the hous of God was ordained with sculptures of *Cherubims*, and other angels, to represent his true hous that is above; as with the circles, quadrats, triangels, rhombos, and rhomboides of wainscot. *The eye*, say you again, *may not have her species as well as the ear, becaus God has commanded the one and not the other.* This Sir you only say. *Fiat Lux* makes it appear, that God commands and commends both, and the nature of man requires both: nor can you give any reason, why I may not look upon him who was crucified, as well as hear of him. You adde. *Nor is the sole end of preaching as Fiat Lux would have it, only to move the mind of the hearers unto corresponding affections.* Why do not you say then, what els it is for? you deny my words, but declare your self no other end, but what I have in those short words expresst. You may haply conceal in your heart som other end of your preaching, which you are loath to speak; as to procure applaus, to vent your rhetorick, to get good benefices, to show your fine cloth and silks, your pure neat white starched bands and cuffs, button'd handkerchiefs and ladies gloves, to inflame factions, get wives, or the like; but I could not think of all things at once; nor needed I to express any more, then that one end of preaching which is connatural, apostolical, and legal. You go on:

God indeed commanded the Cherubims to be set upon the ark, but those cherubims were images of nothing; of what should they be images? Nor were they set up to be adored. Besides God who commanded them to be set up, did no more gainsay his own prohibition of images to be made, than he contradicted his own rule which forbids to steal, when he commanded his people to spoil the Egyptians. But Sir, since the real Cherubims are not made of our beaten gold, those set up by *Moses* must be only figures. And of what els should they be figures but of those real ones. Nor is it either to my purpos or yours, that they are set up to be adored. For images in catholick Churches, are not set up for any such purpos; nor do I any where say it. No man alive has any such thought, nor tradition, no councel hath delivered it, no practis infers it. Christian Philosophers or Schoolmen have indeed raised a philosophical question; *Whether any respect may be terminated upon the figure*, purely as it such an absolute entity in it self, besides that relative one that falls only upon the prototype: But what they question, or what they talk, or what they resolve, does no more belong, becaus they say it, unto catholik faith, then if they had been asleep and said nothing. All catholik councels and practis declares such sacred figures, to be expedient assistants to our thoughts in our divine meditation and prayers: and that is all that

I know of it. And the relative respect that is given to any figur as it is such a figur, whether in a glass, or in any more fixed postur to supply the defects of a mirrour, that it terminates naturally upon the sampler or prototype is evident to right reason and philosophy. And it cannot be otherwise.

That which you speak of the Israelites spoiling the Egyptians by Gods command, hath som species of an argument in it. But Sir, we must know, you as well as I, that God who forbids men to steal, did not then command to steal, as you say he did, when he bad his people spoil the Egyptians under the species of a loan. Many things legitimate that their act of spoil, and clear it from any notion of theft or robbery or stealing. First, they might have of themselvs a right to those few goods, in satisfaction of the long oppression they had unjustly undergon: and it may be that in that their great haste, their own allowance was not then paid them. But secondly, becaus it is a thing of danger, that any servant should be allowed to right himself, by putting his hand to his masters goods, though his case of wrong be never so clear, therfor did the command of God intervene to justifie their action. And the absolute dominion of the whole earth and all that is in it, being inseparably in the hands of God, made that by Gods express command to be truly now and justly the

Hebrews

Hebrews right, which by an inferiour and ſubordinate title, ſuch as is in the hand of creatures, belonged to the Egyptians before. So that the Hebrews in taking thoſe goods with them, did not ſteal: nor did God command them to ſteal, when he bad them carry thoſe goods of the Egyptians with them; for that upon that very command of God they now ceaſed to be the Egyptians any more. But this can no wayes be applied to the buſines of *Images*: nor could God command the Hebrews to make any images, if he had abſolutely forbidden to have any at all made. For this concerns not any affair between neighbour and neighbour, whereof the ſupreme Lord hath abſolute dominion, but the ſervice only and adoration due from man to his maker, which God being eſſentially good and immutably true, cannot alter or diſpens with. Nor doth it ſtand with his natur and deity to chang, diſpens, or vary the firſt table of his law concerning himſelf; I mean as to the ſubſtance of it, by commanding us now to have but one God, then to worſhip two; now not to take his name in vain, and then to blaſpheme it, as he may do the ſecond, which concerns neighbours; for want of that dominion over himſelf, which he hath over any creature, to give or take away its right, to preſerv or deſtroy it, as himſelf pleaſes. God may diſable my neighbours right, and inable me to take

take to my self that which before was his, but he cannot command me to commit idolatry or dishonour himself. If he should deny himself, he would not be God. From hence it must needs follow, that if it be the sens and mind of the almighty, that to set up any images in Churches be derogatory to his glory, then could not God possibly command any to be there set up. For these two precepts, *Thou shalt set up images*, and *Thou shalt set up none*, are not only contradictory in terms of the law proposed, enounced and promulgated, but infer also in God himself that contradiction, opposition and self-denial, which is inconsisting with such an unchangeable veracity. God may possibly allow me either to curs or spoil my neighbour, or in a case expreset not to help him; but he should deny himself, (which the deity cannot do) if either he should command me to blaspheme himself, or the honour due to him either to refuse it him, or give it to another. When therfor one and the same God so often forbids his people to make to *themselvs* any images; and yet in the same divine law commands them to set up Cherubims in his own temple; it cannot, being a concernment of his worship, be otherwayes meant, than that they should make no sculptures or figures, but what himself commands, and which may assuredly represent persons dear to himself, as *Fiat Lux* interprets it.

And

And if an image in it ſelf be oppoſite to Gods glory, as Anticatholiks think; then could not God poſſibly command the making or ſetting up of any, in his holy temple or place of divine worſhip. But you go on.

Fiat Lux ſayes, God forbad forreign images, ſuch as Moloch, Dagon, and Aſtaroth, but he commanded his own. But Fiat lux is deceived in this as well as other things, for God forbad any likeneſſes of himſelf; and he gives the reaſon, becaus, ſaith he, in Horeb ye ſaw no ſimilitude of me. Sir, you may know and conſider, that the ſtatues and graven images of the heathens, towards whoſe land *Iſrael* then in the wilderneſs was journeying, to enter and take poſſeſſion, were ever made by the pagans to repreſent God, and not any devils, although they were deluded in it. And therfor were they called the *gods* of the mountains, the *gods* of the valleys, the *gods* of *Accaron, Moab, &c.* Ther was therfor good reaſon, that the Hebrews, who ſhould be cautioned from ſuch ſnares, ſhould be forbidden to make to *themſelvs* any ſimilitude or likenes of God. What figur or ſimilitude the true God had allowed his people, that let them hold and uſe, until the fulneſs of time ſhould com, when the figur of his ſubſtance, the ſplendour of his glory, and only image of his natur ſhould appear. And now good Sir, ſince God has been pleaſed to ſhow us his face, pray give Chriſtians leav to

uſe,

uſe, and keep, and honour it. If you be otherwiſe minded, and take pleaſur in defacing his figurs, I think they have good reaſon on their ſides, who honour them. You proceed.

It is a pretty fanſy in Fiat Lux, to ſay we have as well a precept, Thou ſhalt make graven images, as we have, Thou ſhalt not. I wonder where Fiat Lux finds that precept, ſith all ancients have it, and all tranſlations read it, Thou ſhalt not. What is that *It* they have, what is that *It* they read? Do you think that *Fiat lux* reads one and the ſame text, both *Thou ſhalt* and *Thou ſhalt not. Moſes* his *making*, and the *command given him to make Cherubims*, is a rule good enough to *Fiat lux*, that ſom images may be made, and ſet up in Churches: as alſo is that precept, *Thou ſhall not make to thy ſelf any images*, another rule to ſhow him, that ſom images we are not to make *to our ſelves* on our own heads, in imitation of pagans.

No leſs whimſical, ſay you, *is that relation Fiat lux ſayes an image hath to ſom one Prototype, for example, to S. Peter rather then to Simon Magus: for ther can be no relation, but what the imagination either of the framer or ſpectatour makes.* Sir, ſpeaking as I do of a formal repreſentation or relation, and not of the efficient caus of it, I cannot but wonder at this your illogical aſſertion. Is the pictur made by the ſpectatours imagination to repreſent this or that thing? or the ima-

imagination rather guided to it by the pictur? By this rule of yours the image of *Cæsar*, did not my imagination help it, would no more represent a man than a mous. I know the imagination can, for want of real picturs, make fantastical ones to its self; in the clouds, walls, air, or fire, *&c.* But when she hath real ones, made her either by art or natur, she cannot make them to be otherwayes then they are; nor think or say, except she will abuse her self to derision, that a cat is a dog, or an oxe a hare. Nor does it help you at all, that ther may be mistakes; for we treat not here of the errours but natures of things. And you will not I hope maintain, that ther is no real heat any where, but what the imagination makes, becaus the good poor man of *Norway* sent out of his own countrey upon an errand, stood warming his fingers there, at a hedg of red roses.

18 *ch. from page* 325. *to* 365.

Your eighteenth chapter, which is upon my paragraff of *Tongues* or *Latin service*, hath som colour of plausibility. But becaus you neither do, nor will understand the customs of that Church, which you are eager to oppose; all your words are but wind. I have heard many grave protestant divines, ingeniously acknowledge, that divine comfort and sanctity of life requisite to salvation which religion aims at, may with more perfection and less inconvenience

ence be attained by the customs of the Roman Church, which gives the sense, life, and meaning of Gods word to the people, without the hard shell of the letter, than that of ours, which gives it in the shell to break peoples teeth. Religion is not to sit pierching upon the lips, but to be got by heart, it consists not in reading but doing; and in this, not in that, lives the substance of it, which is soon and easily conveighed. Christ our Lord drew a compendium of all divine truths into two words, which his great apostle again abridged into one. And if the several gospels for every day in the year, which are or may be in the hands of all catholiks, the chiefest particles of divine epistles, books of sacred history and meditation upon all the mysteries of salvation, and spiritual treatises for all occasions and uses, which be numberles amongst catholiks, adjoyned to the many several rites of examination of conscience, daily and continual practis of prayer and fasting, and an orderly commemoration of the things God hath wrought for us throughout the year, which all by law are tied to observ, and do observ them, may not give a sufficient acquaintance of what concerns our salvation, and promote them enough towards it, I am to seek what it is that can; or what further good it may do, to read the letter of Saint *Pauls* epistles, to the *Romans* for example, or *Corinthians*, wherin questions,

and

and cases and theological discourses are treated, that vulgar people can neither understand, nor are at all concerned to know. And I pray you tell me ingeniously, and without heat, what more of good could accrew to any by the translated letter of a book, whereof I will be bold to say, that nine parts in ten concern not my particular, either to know or practis, than by the conceived substance of Gods will to me, and my own duty towards him? or what is ther now here in *England* when the letter of scriptur is set open to every mans eye, any more either of peace or charity, piety or justice, than in former catholik times, when the substance of Gods word and will was given people in short, and the observance of their duty prolixly prest upon them. What did they do in those ancient catholik times? they flockt every day in the week to their Churches, which stood continually open, there to pray and meditate, and renew their good purposes; they sung psalms, hymns, and canticles all over the land both day and night; they built all our churches, that we have at this day remaining amongst us, and as many more, which we have razed and pulled down; they founded our universities, established our laws, set out tythes and glebe-land for their clergy, built hospitals, erected corporations; in a word, did all the good things we found don for our good in this our native kingdom. But

now,

Quid agitur in Anglia? Consulitur de religione. The former Christians practised, and we dispute: they had a religion, we are still seeking one: they exercised themselvs in good works by the guidance of their holy catholik faith which leads to them, all these works we by our faith evacuate as menstruous rags: they had the substance of true religion in their hearts, we the text in our lips: they had nothing to do but to conform their lives to Gods will, all our endeavour is to apply Gods word to our own factions. Sir mistake me not: The quellion between us, is not, *Whether the people are to have Gods word, or no?* but whether that word consists in the letter left to the peoples dispofal, or in the substance urgently imposed upon people for their practis. And this becaus you understand not, but mistake the whole business, all your talk in this your eighteenth chapter vades into nothing.

Where *Fiat Lux* sayes in that forenamed paragraff, that the *Pentateuch* or *hagiography* was never by any High-priest among the Jews put into a vulgar tongue, nor the *Gospel* or *Liturgy* out of greek in the Eastern part of the Christian Church, or latin in the Western: You slight this discours of mine, becaus hebrew, greek, and latin was, say you, vulgar tongues themselvs. I know this well enough. But when and how long ago were they so? not for som-

hundreds of years to my knowledge. And was the Bible, Psalms, or Christian liturgy, then put into vulgar tongues, when those they were first writ in, ceased to be vulgar? This you should have spoke to, if you had meant to say any thing, or gain-say me. Nor is it to purpos, to tell me that S. *Jerome* translated the Bible into *Dalmatian*, I know well enough it has been so translated by some special persons into *Gothish*, *Armenian*, *Ethiopian*, and other particular dialects. But did the Church either of the Hebrews or Christians, either greek or latin, ever deliver it so translated to the generality of people, or use it in their service, or command it so to be don, as a thing of general concernment and necessity? So far is it from this, that they would never permit it. This I said, and I first said it, before you spoke, and your meer gain-say without further reason or probability of proof cannot dispossess me.

Dr. *Cousins*, now bishop of *Durham*, lately sojourneying in *Paris*, when he understood of a grecian bishops arrival there, did with some other English Gentlemen in his company give him a visit, and with the same or like company went afterwards to see him. The articles of our English Church were translated into greek, and shown him. Many questions were asked him about the service of the grecian Church, praying for the dead, invocation of Saints, real pre-

presence, confession, &c. Dr. *Cousins* can tell himself what answer he received from that venerable grave prelate *Cyrillus*, archbishop of *Trapesond*; for that was his name and title. In brief, he owned not those articles, as any way consonant to the faith of the Greeks, who believed and had ever practised the contrary. He also told them distinctly and openly, that *Mass* or *Liturgy* was, and had ever been the great work of their Christianity all over the greek Church; that confession of sins to a priest, praying for the dead, invocation of saints, and such like points wherein we in *England* differ from papists, were all great parts of their religion, and their constant practis. Finally, he let them know, that all the Liturgies, both those of St. *Basil*, St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, were ever kept in the learned greek, differing from the vulgar language. And withall showed his own greek book of *Liturgy*, which he used himself at the altar. Dr. *Cousins* did himself see him officiate with his lay-brother a monk of St. *Basil*, belonging to St. *Catherins* monastery in mount *Sina*, ministring to him at the altar; and found both by his words and practis, that in all those and other essential parts and observances of Christianity the Greeks agreed perfectly with the Roman Church. This testimony, Sir, of a venerable arch-bishop, to such a worthy person as Dr. *Cousins*, might I

should think suffice to justifie my words, and make you beleev with me, that Christian Liturgies have ever been used, as *Fiat Lux* speaks in a learned language distinct from the vulgar. But we need not go far from home for a testimony. Neither the Bible nor Service-book was ever seen here in *England* for a thousand years space in any other language but Latin, before *Edward* the sixt dayes, (except haply the Psalter, which the Saxons and almost all people, have ever had in their own tongue, being a chief part of Christians devotion) nor in Brittish or Welch, before the byshop of *S. Asaphs* translation. And yet the people all that while wanted no knowknowledge of Gods will, or comfort of his word.

You mightily insult over me in your 336 page, for saying, that the *bible was kept by the Hebrews in an ark or tabernacle*, not touched by the people, but brought out at times to the priest, that he might instruct the people out of it. Here, say you, the *authour of Fiat Lux betrayes his gross ignorance and something more: for the ark was placed in sanctum sanctorum, and not entered but by the priest only once a year, wheras the people were weekly instructed.* But Sir, do I speak there of any *sanctum sanctorum*, or of any ark in that place? Was ther, or could ther be no more arks but one? If you had been only in these latter dayes, in any synagogue or con-

ven-

vention of Jews, you might have seen even now how the bible is kept still with them in an ark or tabernacle, in imitation of their fore-fathers, when they have now no *sanctum sanctorum* amongst them. You may also discern, how according to their custom, they cringe and prostrate at the bringing out of the bible, which is the only solemn adoration left amongst them; and that there be more arks than that in *sanctum sanctorum*. If I had called it a *box* or *chest* or *cupboard*, you had let it pass. But I used the word *Ark* as more sacred.

19 ch. from page 365. to 386.

I discerned in your nineteenth chapter, which is upon my paragraff of *Communion in one kind*, a somwhat more than ordinary swelling choller; which moved me to look over that my paragraff afresh. And I found my fault: there is in it so much of Christian reason and sobriety, that if I had since the time I first wrote it, swerved from my former judgment, of the probability I conceived to be in that Roman practis of communicating in one kind, I had there met with enough to convert my self. And therfor wondered no more, that you should load me so heavily with your wonted imputations of fraud, ignorance, blasphemy, and the like. I ever perceiv you to be then most of all passionate, when you meet with most convincing reasons. When the exorcist is most innocent, his patient, they say,

then frets and foams and curses most. Ther is not a word in this your chapter, which is not by way of anticipation answered in that my § of *Fiat Lux*, against which you write.

20 *th. from page* 386. *to* 402.

Ther is in your twentieth chapter, which prosecutes my paragraff of *Saints* or *Hero's*, one word of yours, that requires my notice. I say in that my paragraff, that the pagans derided the ancient Christians for three of their usages. First, for *eating their own God*: Secondly, for *kneeling to the Priests genitals*: Thirdly, for *worshipping an asses head*. This last you except against, and impute my story *to my own simplicity and ignorance, if not to somthing wors*; *for that imputation*, say you, *was not laid upon Christians at all, but only upon Jews, as may be seen in Josephus*, &c. But Sir, you may know, that *in odium* the primitive Christians were ever numbred among the Jews; and what evil report lay upon these, was charged also upon them, though somtimes upon another ground. And although *Josephus* may excuse the Jews, and not the Christians; yet a long while after his time, if not even then also, that slander was generally all over the pagan world charged upon Christians also, as may be read in *Tertullian*, and other ancient writers; yea and very probably, by the very Jews themselvs, who bitterly hated them, cast off from themselvs upon the poor Christians

on

on another account, which I specified in *Fiat Lux.* And through the whole Roman Empire did the sound of this scandal ring up and down for som ages together. Insomuch that *Tertullian* himself conceited, that as the Christian religion was derived from the Jews; so likewise that the imputation of the *asses head*, first put upon the Jews, might from them be derived upon Christian religion. And the same *Tertullian*, in his *Apologetick* addes these words: "The calumnies, saith he, invented to cry "down our religion grew to such excess of im- "piety, that not long ago in this very city, a "pictur of our God was shown by a certain "infamous person, with the ears of an ass, and "a hoof on one of his feet, clothed with a "gown, and a book in his hand; with this in- "scription, *This is Onochoetes the God of Chri- "stians.* And he addes, that the Christians in "the city, as they were much offended with the "impiety; so did they not a little wonder at "the strange uncouth name the vaillain had put "upon their lord and master; *Onochoetes* for- sooth, he must be called *Onochoetes.* And are not you Sir a strange man, to tell me, page 393. that what *I speak of this business is notoriously fals, nay and that I know it is fals, and I cannot produce one authentick testimony, no not one of any such thing.* But this is but your ordinary confidence.

21 ch. from page 402. to 416.

I must not marvel that my following paragraff, called *Dirge*, is so *wantonly plaid upon*, in your one and twentieth chapter. You think of no body after they are dead; nor does it at all concern you, whether they be in hell, or heaven, or som third place, or not at all. But Sir, were not all the ancient monuments of the foundations of our churches, colledges, and chappels in *England* now destroyed, you would find your self with that wretched opinion of yours, absolutely incapable to enter upon any benefice, cure, or employment in this land. But the times are changed, and you have nothing now to do, but to eat, drink, and preach; for to morrow you shall dye.

22 ch. from page 416 to 435.

In your two and twentieth chapter, which is of the *Pope*, you do but only repeat my words, and not understand, and deny, and laugh.

23 ch. from page 435. to Finis.

Your last chapter is upon my paragraff of *Popery*, wherin I set down eleven other parcels of catholik profession, all of them innocent, unblamable and sacred. You only bite at *the first of them*; and having it seems enough filled your self with that, your wearied bones go to rest.

With *Mas comedido*, the title of my last paragraff

graff you meddle not at all: It is doubtless to you who understand not the English word *Messach*, another Gnostick *Paldabaoth*. But I would you had *Mas comedido* by heart.

You cannot but marvel, that I have taken so little notice all this while, of your only one strong and potent Argument, your stout *Achilles* that meets me in every paragraff and period, and beats me back into the walls of *Troy*. Wherever I am, whatsoever I say, your πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχίλλευς is upon me. All the discours of my whole one and thirty paragraffs, is by it fell'd to the ground, miserably bruised and battered with that one and the same Τόνδε ἀπομειζόμενος. But I hope you will have me excused. I have not leasur; I am not willing; I want ability to answer it, or give you any corresponding satisfaction. *The like to our Authour*, say you, *for flourishing empty words and cunning sleights of subtilty hath been seldom* &c. *Here our Authour falls into a great misadventure*, &c. *Here our Authour discovers not only his gross ignorance, but somthing more*, &c. *Our Authour beleevs not a word of all this, nor can*, &c. *We finde our Authour never to fail so palpably and grosly, as when*, &c. *Our Authour speaks notoriously fals, nor hath he*, &c. *Our Authours history, philosophy and reason all alike*, &c. *Our Authour speaks boldly, though he know it is not so, but*, &c. *Our Authour, if I could com to speak to him, would not*

own

own any of this, &c. Never any such cunning dissembling hypocrite as our Author, &c. It is no marvail our Author should still fail both in philosophy, antiquity, &c. who hath not, &c. In these and such like arguments, which occur almost as oft as the pages of your book, you rout *Our Author* utterly. I am in all this not able to say boh to a goos. Although I be not conscious of any either fraud in my breast, or fault in my book, or lye in either; yet in all such talk you must, and will, and shall have both the first and last word too.

Another argument of yours expresst in twenty places of your Animadversions, by which you would dissipate at once great part of *Fiat Lux* into the air, does as finely cant, as this does courtly defy. *The religion,* say you, *that is now profest in England, is that and only that which was first in ancient times received here,* &c. This you speak, and the more confidently do you speak it, the less significant you know your words be, and yet sounding well enough for your design. What do you mean I pray you Sir, by *that religion that is now profest in England?* Why do you not specify it? Speak it in down-right language. Is it *Popery* that has been peaceably profest in the land for almost a thousand years, and did all the good things we now finde in it; as yet profest by som? No; this you will deny. Is it *Prelate-Protestancy* that for threescore years

oppresst

oppreſt Popery here? If you had ſaid this, you had praiſed that too much, which your ſelf approves not. Is it *Presbytery* that warred the laſt twenty years, and utterly deſtroyed the foreſaid Proteſtancy? In ſaying this you had to your own danger diſabled the Engliſh Proteſtant Church, now to the great heart-burning of the Presbyterians eſtabliſht again by law. Is it *Independency*, that for ſix or ſeven years curbed the Presbyterian here, in —Tectour *Oliver's* time, and had almoſt paſt an Act for the aboliſhing of the three P. P. P. Papiſh, Proteſtant, and Presbyterian. Is it *Quakery*, that is now far enough ſpread, and openly profeſt by many, and judges the Papiſt ſtark naught, the Proteſtant half rotten, the Presbyterian a quarter addle, and other Independents imperfect? Is it ſom general *abſtracted religion*, that is common to them all? If it be ſo, then Popery as well as any other may be juſtly ſtiled the religion here firſt received. For that common notion in whatever you ſhall ſay it conſiſts, ſo it be poſitive as it ought to be, will be found firſt and principally in the Papiſts faith. But this you have not thought good your ſelf to expres, that you may ſeem to expres ſomthing, that may be thought good to your ſelf, and ill to me. But you muſt deal candidly with me: I am an old oxe that hath fixed his foot firmly, and am not to be out-braved either with your cant-

ing

ing words or passionate execrations.

I had told you Sir, of all your tricks from page to page in particular, if nothing had been required at my hands to write, but only my own reply: but being, if I should do so, obliged to set down your talk too, I think it not worth either my charge or labour to reflect upon you such your voluminous impertinencies. And I have I assure you taken notice of all in your book, that may seem to have any appearance of reason in it, (though really there be none at all against me) and is not either manifestly untrue, or absolutely improper. This is all.

And now good Sir, I could wish you had given me the first letter of your name; that I might have known how to salute you. I have been told of late, that the Authour of the *Animadversions* upon *Fiat Lux* is one Doctour *O. N*, a Protestant against Popery which you found down, a Presbyterian against Protestancy which you threw down, an Independent against Presbyterianry which you kept down. But whether you be Doctour *O. N*, or to turn your inside outwards, you be *N. O* Doctour; since I cannot be assured, it shall be all one to me. All that I have undertook at this time is to let you know, who ever you be, that I have read over your *Animadversions* upon my *Fiat*. And I thank you for your book; for it confirms

firms *Fiat Lux*, and all the whole design of it, I think irrefragably. It shows to the eye and really verrifies by your own example, what *Fiat Lux* did but speak in words: namely that controversies of religion are endles for want of some one thing to fix upon, which may not be depraved; that they are fraught with uncharitable animosities, which darken the understanding and deprave good manners; that they are mutable as mens fansies be, which can never be fixedly stated, sith every man hath a spirit, hath a method, hath an opinion of his own, and sayes and denyes with endles diversity; that they are guileful and delusory, sometimes fals on both sides, ever on one, and yet still made out with subtil words, so plausible to the eye and ear, that men employed in the multitude of affairs and troubles of this world, can never be able to disintangle those knots of *pro* and *con*; then especially at a loss, when they consider, that such as manage those disputes are all of them interested persons; fiftly, that they are mad and irrational, while all parties pretend one and the same rule of holy scriptur, and yet will admit of no exteriour visible judg in their visible exteriour contests: lastly, that they are mischievous and fatal to all places where they rise: as they have been of late to this our distressed Kingdom of *England*, where disputes and controversies about religion

gion raised to a height, by the inferiour scribes against their prelates, drew after them pike and guns to make them good for twenty years together, with much desolation and ruin; which times I think I may not unjustly call the *Vicars Wars*. For the inferiour priests and levites, envying the dignities, glory and revenues of their prelates, when they could not otherwise get them into their own hands, by their lamentable tones in *Eloimi*, raised up the people of the land, to further their design. This trick of theirs they learned from wolves. For these, when they spy a waifaring man whom they would devour, and yet by a narrow search perceiv him to be too strong for them, starting aside upon som *hillock*; there set upon their tails, they howl for help.

And if any will not beleev *Fiat Lux*, that such be the fruits of disputes and controversies, and such their nature and *genius*, let them beleev the Authour of *Animadversions*; who as he sayes what he pleases, and denies what he lists; so to his frequent reproaches, villifications and slanders he adjoyns his own menaces of terrour, to make my words good, and justify *Fiat Lux*.

You frequently threaten me, that if I write again, I shall *hear more*, far more than you have said in your *Animadversions*: but I promis you Sir, if you write again, you shall never hear more

more from me. For now the flies begin to com into my chamber, which may haply expect I ſhould heed their flight and hearken to their buzz; and I muſt not leav thoſe greater employments to look upon your *Animadverſions*, or any your other books. Farewell.

Given this *V.* of the *Ides* of *April* in the year of our Lord *MDCLXIII.*

J. V. C.

---

ing words or paſſionate execrations.

I had told you Sir, of all your tricks from page to page in particular, if nothing had been required at my hands to write, but only my own reply: but being, if I ſhould do ſo, obliged to ſet down your talk too, I think it not worth either my charge or labour to reflect upon you ſuch your voluminous impertinencies. And I have I aſſure you taken notice of all in your book, that may ſeem to have any appearance of reaſon in it, (though really ther be none at all againſt me) and is not either manifeſtly untrue, or abſolutely improper. This is all.

And now good Sir, I could wiſh you had given me the firſt letter of your name; that I might have known how to ſalute you. I have been told of late, that the Authour of the *Animadverſions* upon *Fiat Lux* is one Doctour *O. N*, a Proteſtant againſt Popery which you found down, a Presbyterian againſt Proteſtancy which you threw down, an Independent againſt Presbyterianry which you kept down. But whether you be Doctour *O. N.* or to turn your inſide outwards, you be *N. O* Doctour; ſince I cannot be aſſured, it ſhall be all one to me. All that I have undertook at this time is to let you know, who ever you be, that I have read over your *Animadverſions* upon my *Fiat*. And I thank you for your book; for it confirms

firms *Fiat Lux*, and all the whole deſign of it, I think irrefragably. It ſhows to the eye and really verrifies by your own example, what *Fiat Lux* did but ſpeak in words: namely that controverſies of religion are endles for want of ſome one thing to fix upon, which may not be depraved; that they are fraught with uncharitable animoſities, which darken the underſtanding and deprave good manners; that they are mutable as mens fanſies be, which can never be fixedly ſtated, ſith every man hath a ſpirit, hath a method, hath an opinion of his own, and ſayes and denyes with endles diverſity; that they are guileful and deluſory, ſometimes fals on both ſides, ever on one, and yet ſtill made out with ſubtil words, ſo plauſible to the eye and ear, that men employed in the multitude of affairs and troubles of this world, can never be able to diſintangle thoſe knots of *pro* and *con*; then eſpecially at a loſs, when they conſider, that ſuch as mannage thoſe diſputes are all of them intereſted perſons; fiftly, that they are mad and irrational, while all parties pretend one and the ſame rule of holy ſcriptur, and yet will admit of no exteriour viſible judg in their viſible exteriour conteſts: laſtly, that they are miſchievous and fatal to all places where they riſe: as they have been of late to this our diſtreſſed Kingdom of *England*, where diſputes and controverſies about religion

gion raiſed to a height, by the inferiour ſcribes againſt their prelates, drew after them pikes and guns to make them good for twenty years together, with much deſolation and ruin; which times I think I may not unjuſtly call the *Vicars Wars*. For the inferiour prieſts and levites, envying the dignities, glory and revenues of their prelates, when they could not otherwiſe get them into their own hands, by their lamentable tones in *Eloimi*, raiſed up the people of the land, to further their deſign. This trick of theirs they learned from wolves. For theſe, when they ſpy a waifaring man whom they would devour, and yet by a narrow ſearch perceiv him to be too ſtrong for them, ſtarting aſide upon ſom *hillock*; there ſet upon their tails, they howl for help.

And if any will not beleev *Fiat Lux*, that ſuch be the fruits of diſputes and controverſies, and ſuch their nature and *genius*, let them beleev the Authour of *Animadverſions*, who as he ſayes what he pleaſes, and denies what he liſts; ſo to his frequent reproaches, villifications and ſlanders he adjoyns his own menaces of terrour, to make my words good, and juſtify *Fiat Lux*.

You frequently threaten me, that if I write again, I ſhall *hear more*, far more than you have ſaid in your *Animadverſions*: but I promis you Sir, if you write again, you ſhall never hear more

more from me. For now the flies begin to com into my chamber, which may haply expect I should heed their flight and hearken to their buzz; and I must not leav those greater employments to look upon your *Animadversions*, or any your other books. Farewell.

Given this *V.* of the *Ides* of *April* in the year of our Lord *MDCLXIII.*

J. V. C.

Epistola

EPISTOLA
AD
CROESUM,
AGAINST
Mr. Whitby.

The occasion of this second Epistle.

Doctour Pierce *had preached a Sermon in the Court upon that text,* In the beginning it was not so; *from whence he took occasion to speak of Popery, which in this and that and the other particular, be said in* the beginning was not so, *and consequently all of it a novelty. This sermon was afterwards printed, and not a little applauded by those who are taken with such airs. Mr.* Cressy *a Catholik Gentleman, the Authours friend, then sojourning in* London, *wrote a book called,* Catholik doctrin no novelties, *in confutation of that Sermon, and went presently away to Paris. But after his departure Mr.* Whitby *set forth a huge bulk of a book against* Cressy. *The Authour in this his epistle gives notice to Mr.* Cressy *his friend then in France, of the contents and tenour of that his adversaries book.*

Epiſtola ad *Croeſum*, againſt Mr. *Whitby*.

SIR,

IT is now about a year, ſince Dr. *Pierce* made his pretty featous Sermon in the Court: where, by vertue of thoſe few words of his text, *In the beginning it was not ſo, Matth.* 19. 8. he confuted all Popery in the ſpace of one hour, as a meer bundle of novelties. The Treatiſe you left here in the hands of ſom friends, before your departure to *Paris*, to prove againſt the tenour of the ſaid Sermon, *That Catholik doctrines are no novelties*, printed afterward by I know not what good hand, gave us here in *England*, after your departur, a great deal of good ſatisfaction. This book of yours about a moneth or two after it was extant, was ſeconded by another, againſt Dr. *Pierce* penned by *Jo. Sim.* a ſmall, but a very quick and lively piece, to invalidate his reaſons. So that *Pierce* had now two adverſaries againſt him.

The latter *J. S.* hears not yet of any reply. But your book Sir is lately anſwered, not by Dr. *Pierce* himſelf, (who hath other irons in the

fire, and meets now with somthing in his own life, which in the beginning was not so) but by one Mr. *Daniel Whitby*, a young man, of a forward spirit, and possest as it seems of a fair reformed library, who hath undertaken, or is willing atleast to undergo the quarrel. This book of *Whitbyes*, wherof my antient love and friendship hath here invited me to give you a brief account, is a great volum of 512 pages, so fruitful is the seed of controversie, when it is once sown, to increase and multiply. A compendium it is, I think, of his whole library.

Whether this book of his be made up all by one hand, by reason of the unity of the name, and diversity of stiles discerned in it, is not easy to gues. But that Mr. *Whitby*, if he had many coadjutors with him, either in his own chamber or abroad, should by their mutual consent, alone reap the honour of all their labours, wherof his own part may haply be the least; you need, Sir, neither grutch, nor fear, nor envy, nor any way dislike. The book is of that natur, that it more behoovs, it should be thought to issue from one young head, then many old ones; that the insufficiency, when it shall appear, may be rather attributed to the weaknes of the Author, then caus he pleads for. Of this, Sir, I may out of *Whitbyes* own words in his Epistle Dedicatory, and the whole progres of his book, assure you; that this volume of his, is wholly

wholly made up of the many ſeveral replies of divers Proteſtant writers, who have ſtretcht their wits to the utmoſt in this laſt age, to evacuate the Catholik faith, and all their grounds, autorities and reaſons for it; not only ſuch as have written here in *England*, which are not a few, but thoſe alſo beyond the ſeas, who are all met friendly here together, though never ſo much differing in their wayes, twenty at leaſt or thirty of the chiefeſt, to help to make up Mr. *Whitbies* book.

Theſe writers he tells us in his Epiſtle, ſom of them, who they be; Hammond, Field, Salmaſius, Baron, Uſher, Fern, Dally, Taylor, Crackanthorp, Hall, Andrews, Calixtus, Pleſſis, Chamier and Chillingworth. But he does not there mention Pareus, Blondel, Baxter, and ſeveral others, whom in the context of his book he makes as much uſe of, as any of thoſe he there honours with the title of Champions, with whoſe ſword and buckler he means to defend himſelf, and knock you down. You may eaſily gueſs the reaſon. Although indeed, even Chamier, Pleſſis, and Dally, his firſt and chiefeſt three, wer as great Puritans, as *Baxter*, *Pareus*, or *Blondel*, and no leſs enemies to the Engliſh Proteſtant, then Roman Catholik Church. And *Baxter* himſelf, if he will but do ſo much as dye, ſhall ſeven year hence, if not ſooner, be put into the next calendar, and ſit among the

Champions of the Engliſh Church, cited no more then, as guilty of faction and hereſy, but as a Protector and Patron of the truth, famous Baxter, incomparable Baxter. So p. 230. he cites Dr. Reynolds, as a great Champion of his Church, who was indeed a Champion of the Puritans againſt it. Every non-Papiſt is a good Proteſtant, eſpecially when he is dead. When they fight for their wives and children againſt catholik traditions and faith, then are they all holy zealous champions: But they are damned, and ſwerv notoriouſly from the truth, if they may be themſelvs beleeved, when they conteſt with one another; which ever happens after the firſt great victory with the common enemy obtained.

One thing is ſingular in this book of *Whitbies*, that he frames no anſwers out of any judgment of his own, ripened by a long and ſerious conſideration of the things he ſpeaks of, in this his reply; but recurres preſently to the books of thoſe his forenamed maſters, in his library; and againſt your reaſonings, only oppoſes their words and fore-ſtudied evaſions, ſuch as they had invented, each one his own way, upon ſemblable occaſions; not heeding at all, whether your diſcours, againſt which he writes, hath anticipated thoſe ſhifts afore-hand, as generally it does, yea or no; nor how far they evacuate one another. This if he had pondred well, which perhaps poor man he could not do,

it

it had prevented much of his collections, and sunk his huge book into a far smaller bulk. *To this*, quoth he, *hath Chamier told you, that*, &c. *Can you not see what incomparable Chillingworth hath taught you, that*, &c. *You will still be impertinent, although great Plessis hath informed you, that*, &c. *Where wer your eyes, when reverend Hall hath so plainly told you, that*, &c.

And he brings somtimes, not only four or five several answers of one author to the same thing, all I suppose he found there written in his book, but half a dozen of those his authors, with all their manifold evasions to one single catholik ground; and for the most part so confusedly, that the first answer of the first author hath presently another first, as consisting of two parts; and the first of them may haply have another first; so that three succeeding periods begin oftentimes with three *firsts*, one after another, according as he penned them hand over head out of the books he wrote, venting his reasons, as som young children void worms, three or four, head and tails together. Nor heeds he at all, whether these his authors do chance to contradict one another, in those affairs for which he brings them in so unnaturally together; one affirming what the other denies, one rejecting what the other allows, one distinguishing what the other absolutely grants, &c.

This benefit he will reap by this confused

interlocution of his maſters; that, if he com to be challenged upon any of the anſwers, which he makes by their lips, he ſhall not need, when he findes them either weak or fals, or any way prejudicial, to own then for his, what he had openly profeſt before-hand, to be another mans replies. So that they will ſerv a bird all bedecked with the feathers of many a fowl, for pride and pompous ſhow unto ſuch as will admire him, and to ſuch as ſhall queſtion him, for a preſent remedy of excuſe, *This is not my feather, but the Cuckows. It is not my ſaying, but Chamiers. It is the reply of Chillingworth: It is the ſpeech of Dr. Hammond, and not any aſſertion of mine, &c.* What can any one do, Sir, to ſuch a man, but neglect him?

Truly I look upon *Whitby*, as a kind of maſter of Revels, that appoints other men who are to ſpeak, every one their parts, and gives them their *qu* of entrance, whilſt himſelf ſtands in ſom privat place to look on, and ſee how they do perform.

And he provides commonly againſt any one of your catholik grounds or reaſons for it, four or five Proteſtant ſpeakers, by their ſeveral wayes to diſable it: wherof one ſhall haply ſay, that the autority you bring is good, but carries another meaning; a ſecond ſhall affirm, it is naught and forged; a third ſtands indifferent, whether it be admitted or no, but is ſure

it

it makes againſt you; a fourth acknowledges it for your purpos, but diſparages the authour, whence it is taken; a fift admits both the autority of the author, and truth of his words, but tells you it is only one of his errors; *Whitby* himſelf not ſaying all the while, which of all theſe replies he holds himſelf for good; but imagining you wholly oppreſt and overwhelmed with his various collection of contradicting drollery, he paſſes on exulting to your next point or following reaſon, in the ſame mode and method to be cruſht.

And truly Sir, one may ſee in this one book of *Whitbies* at a view, what a judicious examiner, who loves to read and ponder all things ſeriouſly, cannot but obſerv in all the writers ſince the reformation, put together. One admits the catholik ground and autority; another rejects and villifies it; another accepts the words, but by ſome trope or other turns the ſens; another allows the natural ſens, but ſayes it is one of his errours; another will not have that, nor any other authority upon earth, to be of any force in thoſe affairs, &c. And thus they do about every particular of antient faith; ſtill laughing, and hugging one anothers fancies, though never ſo much contradictory, as well to one another, as to the common faith they all impugn.

What a ſtrange confuſion would this caus in the

the world, if the like proceeding were countenanced in civil, as here in ſpiritual affairs; and men might be outed of their eſtates and poſſeſſions by half a ſcore witty lawyers, with cunning querks and ſubtle ſophiſtries deluding his right and tenure, no judg admitted to give ſentence. And indeed although this conteſt begin in ſpiritual affairs, yet it ever ends in civil. When they have once outed a Land of their old religion, and the proſperity and peace attending it, mens perſons, eſtates, dignities, nay the very laws of the Land are apprehended, and brought into the power of theſe reformers, to the utter deſolation of a Kingdom.

And as this book of *Whitbies*, Sir, is a compendious mirrour of all Anticatholiks dealing with the old Roman faith; ſo will I give you in civil affairs a perfect emblem of all *Whitbies* book: That all may clearly ſee, if this proceeding be allowable, what confuſion and injuſtice muſt needs follow.

The Emblem of the old Roman religion I make *Caius* the ſeventeenth Knight, for example, of his family, which hath continued in the ſtate time out of mind. A faction riſes, to diſpoſſeſs him of all that he and his anceſtours had ſo long and peaceably enjoyed. They tell him in general, that his anceſtors were intruders: but differ very much about the time, when the invaſion was firſt made. One ſayes 200 year ago, another

another 800, another 500, several men, several wayes, and cannot agree. They com at last to his own particular title. *Caius* shews his forefathers succession legally descending, and quietly possessing for so many generations; and an evident testament also for himself, wherin it is expresly said, *Ego Gonvillus, &c. constituo Caium filium meum heredem bonorum meorum omnium, &c. I Gonvil do constitute my son Caius heir of all my goods, &c.* The adversaries, put case Chamier, Dally, Plessis, Blondel, Baxter, Hammond, Hall, &c. laugh at this, and tell him it is all impertinent, and proves nothing.

1 Alas quoth *Chamier*, these words are plainly corrupted. It was not written *Caium* but *Saium*: And the corruption is easie, only the bottom of the first letter being razed out. 2. Let it be as you will, quoth *Dally*, this testament can be of no value. For it proceeds upon an uncertain, if not fals, supposition. Who can say assuredly, that either you are his son *Caius*, or that *Caius* is indeed his son. 3. Either, quoth Chillingworth, you must be his son and actual heir, while he was alive, or when he was dead. Not while he was alive; for the right can be but in one at once: Not when he was dead, for no man can be a son to one that is not; no more then any person that is alive, can be a father to one that has no being. 4. Were this right, quoth Baxter, which is conveighed to you, in your father

father only, or in ſom others alſo beſides himſelf? If in himſelf alone, why doth he ſay *conſtituo*, which ſignifies *ſimul ſtatuo*, or I appoint together with others. 5. It ſeems to me, quoth *Blondel*, that this teſtament, Mr *Caius* is rather againſt, then with you. Either you pretend to be his ſon, before his teſtament was made, or after. If before, your own evidence witneſſes againſt you; *Conſtituo Caium filium meum*, I make Caius my ſon. If after; then by this teſtament you are made his ſon, but ſuppoſed only an heir: and a title for that here is none at all. 6. He does indeed, quoth *Pleſſis*, make him truly his heir. But of what? not of his eſtate, which we contend about; but only of his goods, all his goods. And can you think Mr. *Caius*, that a dying man would ſpeak improperly? ſurely no. The goods of the mind, vertue, prudence, temperance, theſe, as Ariſtotle witneſſes, are *proprie bona*, properly are only to be called goods: But the goods of the body, and goods of fortune, theſe are improperly and falſly ſo called. 7. Let it be what kind of goods you will, quoth *Hall*, this very word *meorum*, Mr. Caius, quite overthrows all your pretenſions. Theſe are your fathers words you ſay; well then, if it be ſo, either the ſtate you plead for is now his, or now not his. If it be now his, then it is not yours; if it be now not his, then the very title you rely upon is fals. 8. A teſta-

ment

ment is to be taken in its ſtrict and rigorous ſens, quoth Field, and ſo the word *omnium* ſpoils your plea Mr. Caius. You muſt either have all his goods or none; but you have neither his good face, nor other his good endowments, &c. 9 Com, com, quoth Crackanthorp, we needed not have gon ſo far, or uſed ſo many words. *Caius* pretends, that his father, who made this teſtament, is the laſt of ſeventeen Knights of his family. Out of his own mouth I will condemn him, and with the very firſt word of his will he ſayes his father made, which is *Ego*. For it is clear enough, that *Ego* is the firſt perſon, and not the laſt. And all theſe are uſhered in by a young Whitby. *To this hath Chamier told you, that*, &c. *Can you not ſee what incomparable Chillingworth hath taught you, that*, &c. *You will ſtill be impertinent, though learned Pleſſis hath informed you, that*, &c. *Where were your eyes, when great Dally hath told you, that*, &c.

In theſe few words Sir, I have given you a clear Emblem, not only of this book of Mr. Whitbies, but of all the writings have been made againſt catholik religion, ſince the reformation. Ther is no evidence ſo clear for that antient religion, but it is endeavoured ſeveral wayes to be made fruſtrate: Although unto Catholiks, who underſtand their religion, thoſe evaſions ſignifie no more then theſe I have ſpecified,

againſt

againſt a title moſt irrefragable and firm. Yet in that conteſt children and unexperienced people, would judg poor *Caius* to be utterly loſt. And ſo indeed he will, if thoſe crafty Lawyers may determin the buſines without recours to any Judg: as is don in all our affairs and controverſies of religion. How many ſophiſtical evaſions is he to anſwer about one and the ſame thing? How many captious ſnares to incur, in any one of his anſwers? to be overwhelmed without doubt, while no Judg interpoſes, either with their multitude of words, or force of arms. But enough of this, which indeed can never be too much thought of.

Mr. *Whitby*, Sir, begins and ends his book juſt as you begin and end yours, againſt which he writes. For as you in the concluſion of your book ſet down ſom rules, which you deſire him that ſhall reply unto it, for more clearnes and order, and ſubſtantiallity of diſcours, to obſerv; ſo *Whitby* in the end of this his reply againſt your book, wherin he hath not heeded to obſerv ſo much as any one of thoſe your good rules, does alſo preſcribe laws for you, if you mean to anſwer him again, wherof the firſt is, *That you conſider all the anſwers he hath given to any of your arguments: and that otherwis, if any one ſingle anſwer remain, your agument muſt be invalid*, p. 501. This is the firſt and wittieſt of his conditions. For the ſeveral ſhifts and evaſions of

of above twenty men, which he makes uſe of, about moſt of the ſubſtantial points of controverſie, being all put together and multiplied, as they be, to ſom thouſands, would, if they ſhould be all ſpoken to in particular, though never ſo briefly, rais ſuch a bulk of a book, as hath been ſeldom ſeen, and would never be read. But being, as I have already told you, contradictory one to another, and ten to one exceſſively childiſh, would no leſs diſable the repute and gravity of that man, who ſhould ſo much as take notice of them, then to play with boyes at ſpancounter in the ſtreets.

And as he ends his book with the ſame method of preſcribing laws, as you concluded yours; ſo doth he begin his in the very ſelfſame words as you enter yours. *I cannot forbid my ſelf to wonder that*, &c. So begins your book. *I cannot forbid my ſelf to wonder that*, &c. ſo begins this book of his, which he writes againſt you, imitating and repeating your very words for many lines together, and returning them hand over head upon your ſelf, by the method of our good women of Billingſgate, not caring, ſo he ſay again what you ſpeak, how true or fals, juſt or unjuſt his words be.

Thus much in general, I ſhall ſay more by and by, after I have briefly told you, what he does in each particular chapter of his book.

His first ch. from page 1 to 7.

Is a bitter invective against Papists, whom he concludes for their cruelties and disloyalty, unworthy of mercy or any affection. He acknowledges indeed, that *Catholik religion cannot stand justly charged with any such crimes*, p. 2. But yet he layes the crimes upon them all notwithstanding, so indefinitely, and only upon them, that he excludes universally all professours of that religion, and them alone, from all compassion and love: Although he knows in his heart, both that the religion, the very religion of som others in this land, stands justly charged with those crimes, whereof he acknowledges catholik religion free; and that Papists also or Roman Catholiks, are the only men, that have universally exhibited themselvs unblamable, towards that breast of love and mercy, from whence he would have them all excluded.

And to make these Papists odious, he names som wars and troubles of theirs in Ireland, Poland, Bohemia, Savoy. Indeed he needed not have wandred so far as Bohemia or Poland. The story of our own England would have afforded a large volum of matter, if all that Papists have ever don must be attributed to their religion, for wars and broils enough to tire a reader. How many battles have there been here between the Scot and English, between the Sax and Norman, between the Norman and Britton,

ton, between the English and French at Agencourt, and all over France, with much bloodshed and slaughter; between the two houses of York and Lancaster at home, when all these parties were Papists, and no other religion known amongst them. Is there no other principle to attribute all these disorders unto, but that religion, which endeavours, as much as it is able, to stifle all these evil fruits of concupiscence amongst men; which som time or other will shoot up, notwithstanding all the heavenly endeavour of that divine seed, implanted in men on purpos to suppres it. Must or can Protestants be justly charged, with the treasons, murders, robberies of all such as have been imprisoned in our Jayls, or hanged at Tyburn, since the reformation? And yet thus we deal with poor Catholiks, to adde affliction upon affliction, and extinguish that small sparkle of life which is left in their bodies.

It is surely a general fault in Protestants, that we think in our hearts, whatever we speak outwardly, that Roman catholiks are, as they should be, all Saints, all spotles in their lives, all of them unblamable, universally unblameable. And hence it is, that if ever we discover one traytor, fool, or knave amongst any of that profession, we exult and make bonefires for joy, and record it in our books one age after another; that all the world may know, and ever

againſt a title moſt irrefragable and firm. Yet in that conceſt children and unexperienced people, would judg poor *Cain* to be utterly loſt. And ſo indeed he will, if thoſe crafty Lawyers may determin the buſines without recours to any Judg: as is don in all our affairs and controverſies of religion. How many ſophiſtical evaſions is he to anſwer about one and the ſame thing? How many captious ſnares to incur, in any one of his anſwers? to be overwhelmed without doubt, while no Judg interpoſes, either with their multitude of words, or force of arms. But enough of this, which indeed can never be too much thought of.

Mr. *Whitby*, Sir, begins and ends his book juſt as you begin and end yours, againſt which he writes. For as you in the concluſion of your book ſet down ſom rules, which you deſire him that ſhall reply unto it, for more clearnes and order, and ſubſtantiallity of diſcours, to obſerv; ſo. *Whitby* in the end of this his reply againſt your book, wherin he hath not heeded to obſerv ſo much as any one of thoſe your good rules, does alſo preſcribe laws for you, if you mean to anſwer him again, wherof the firſt is, *That you conſider all the anſwers he hath given to any of your arguments: and that otherwis, if any one ſingle anſwer remain, your agument muſt be invalid*, p. 501. This is the firſt and wittieſt of his conditions. For the ſeveral ſhifts and evaſions

of

of above twenty men, which he makes use of, about most of the substantial points of controversie, being all put together and multiplied, as they be, to som thousands, would, if they should be all spoken to in particular, though never so briefly, rais such a bulk of a book, as hath been seldom seen, and would never be read. But being, as I have already told you, contradictory one to another, and ten to one excessively childish, would no less disable the repute and gravity of that man, who should so much as take notice of them, then to play with boyes at spancounter in the streets.

And as he ends his book with the same method of prescribing laws, as you concluded yours, so doth he begin his in the very self-same words as you enter yours. *I cannot forbid my self to wonder that*, &c. So begins your book. *I cannot forbid my self to wonder that*, &c. so begins this book of his, which he writes against you, imitating and repeating your very words for many lines together, and returning them hand over head upon your self, by the method of our good women of Billingsgate, not caring, so he say again what you speak, how true or fals, just or unjust his words be.

Thus much in general, I shall say more by and by, after I have briefly told you, what he does in each particular chapter of his book.

His

His first ch. from page 1 to 7.

Is a bitter invective against Papists, whom he concludes for their cruelties and disloyalty, unworthy of mercy or any affection. He acknowledges indeed, that *Catholik religion cannot stand justly charged with any such crimes*, p. 2. But yet he layes the crimes upon them all notwithstanding, so indefinitely, and only upon them, that he excludes universally all professours of that religion, and them alone, from all compassion and love: Although he knows in his heart, both that the religion, the very religion of som others in this land, stands justly charged with those crimes, whereof he acknowledges catholik religion free; and that Papists also or Roman Catholiks, are the only men, that have universally exhibited themselvs unblamable, towards that breast of love and mercy, from whence he would have them all excluded.

And to make these Papists odious, he names som wars and troubles of theirs in Ireland, Poland, Bohemia, Savoy. Indeed he needed not have wandred so far as Bohemia or Poland. The story of our own England would have afforded a large volum of matter, if all that Papists have ever don must be attributed to their religion, for wars and broils enough to tire a reader. How many battles have there been here between the Scot and English, between the Sax and Norman, between the Norman and Britton,

ton, between the English and French at Agencourt, and all over France; with much bloodshed and slaughter; between the two houses of York and Lancaster at home, when all these parties were Papists, and no other religion known amongst them. Is there no other principle to attribute all these disorders unto, but that religion, which endeavours, as much as it is able, to stifle all these evil fruits of concupiscence amongst men; which som time or other will shoot up, notwithstanding all the heavenly endeavour of that divine seed, implanted in men on purpos to suppres it. Must or can Protestants be justly charged, with the treasons, murders, robberies of all such as have been imprisoned in our Jayls, or hanged at Tyburn, since the reformation? And yet thus we deal with poor Catholiks, to adde affliction upon affliction, and extinguish that small sparkle of life which is left in their bodies.

It is surely a general fault in Protestants, that we think in our hearts, whatever we speak outwardly, that Roman catholiks are, as they should be, all Saints, all spotles in their lives, all of them unblamable, universally unblameable. And hence it is, that if ever we discover one traytor, fool, or knave amongst any of that profession, we exult and make bonefires for joy, and record it in our books one age after another; that all the world may know, and ever

remember, that even som of them have been transgressors. We do not wonder so at our own Protestants, though thousands of them should prove traytors together, and many are continually hanged, and som also burnt for their wicked crimes. I am sure the Papists have not themselvs, any such opinion of men of their own religion, that they should so necessarily be honest and good, as that it is impossible any should be otherwis. But even in catholik countreys, they have their whips and stocks, and gibbets and prisons, and torturs, provided for malefactors, as well as we have here. And Princes will there go to wars, as well as we. Did not the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* do so? And the people too think themselvs bound, even by their religion, to follow them. Nor have any people rose in rebellious herds, to do mischief, but they would somtimes pretend religion for it, although they act indeed against the dictamen not only of other mens religion, but perhaps their own too. Catholiks know their religion is good, and pure and holy, and apt to make all men so, that walk according to its direction. But if any swerv, they pitty indeed, and pray for their serious repentance; but they wonder not, as we do at it; much less do they rejoyce, when any of our Protestants are taken and hanged for treason; nor do they write, or spread it abroad in books, nor make bonefires, or keep holy-

dayes

dayes for joy of a thing, which is indeed the object of their grief and pitty.

But Mr. *Whitby* speaks here so much of *equivocations* and *mental reservations*, as proper and peculiar only unto Papists, which render them, although they should promis and swear allegiance never so seriously, not at all to be beleeved or trusted; that I began to doubt, whether all London, and the whole Land, may not haply be Papists, although I thought not of it. One thing I am sure of, and all men are of my mind, that when we go into a shop in London, or into any market or fair in England to buy wares, when they tell us, yea and swear too, that the thing we cheapen cost them so much out of their own purse, we do not beleev a word they say, but think they have either som reservation in their mind, or use an equivocation or ly. And even Mr. *Whitby* himself, must either be a Papist too, if mental reservation be peculiar only unto them, when he sayes so often in his book, of which I treat, *That there is not one reason in Mr. Cressey's book that is pertinent, not one authority but corrupted, not one instance but ushered in with disadvantages to the truth, and forgery:* or if he be not a Papist, he must in these and several other passages in this his book, wherin he either secretly equivocates, or openly lyes, at least *papistare*, and act that, which he sayes only Papists practice.

To give one example, he sayes p. 237. *That one general councel calls the respect given to images a hundred times by the name of worship.* I have good reason to think, that one Councel would not use that word much above fourscore times, if they be rightly numbred. So likewise he sayes here p. 4. *That the whole colledg of Jesuits in London said, that they would rather promote the late Kings ruin then hinder it, lest the Puritans should make use of his distresses to any advantage.* O too too foolish and malicious calumny! For surely, this is somthing more then an equivocation. They rather promote then hinder it! How could they do either the one or the other? Thus som of our mad countreymen were not ashamed to tell it abroad, about ten years ago, even in catholik countreys where they travelled, that they who sate in Court, and condemned our gracious King, were most of them Papists and Jesuits. And did all the whole colledg of Jesuits in London conclude this, so generally, that there was not any one against it? Who took the votes, that he could be so assured of this great scret? And where is this colledg of Jesuits in London? Who ever heard of any such thing? Will ever any of this wild talk pass for other, then the dream of a man in Bedlam? We shall ere long be frighted by such as *Whitby* and *Baxter*, from hanging our pot over the fire, lest the whole colledg of Jesuits in the moon,

moon, ſhould conſpire together, to water down upon our heads, and ſpoil our pottage. They would never tell us theſe things, or hope to be beleeved, were not the opinion they hav of our reaſon as ſmall, as the confidence they hav of their own audacity is great? And what will the colledg, the whole colledg of Jeſuits here in London determin next? If they ſhould chance to decree, that no whale, or cod or herring ſhould ever com into the North ſeas, as now it is not unlikely they may, they will undo many a family.

In the end of this his firſt chapter, are cited ſom Councils ſeverity againſt heretiks, wherin Mr *Whitby* thinks himſelf concerned with much regret and anger. *One of theſe*, ſaith he, *was kept at Lateran, the other at Leyden under Pope Innocent.* I ſuppoſe *concilium Lateranum* is the councel he ſayes was kept at Lateran: though his Dictionary of proper words will not help him to underſtand, in what countrey that town of Lateran is to be found. And *concilium Lugdunenſe* is that which he engliſhes the councel of Leyden; all the hiſtory and reading Mr. *Whitby* has, not been able to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Ludunum Batavorum*, and *Lugdunum in Gallia*; betwixt Leyden in Holland, where never any councel was kept, and Lyons in France, where Pope Innocent held that councel, whilſt he ſojourned in Burgundy. But though he be

yet but raw, you shall find him a greater proficient by and by.

As for that councel of Lateran, wherin is a confiscation of goods and other penalties decreed, upon such as run into disturbing heresies; it touched only exteriour disciplin or temporal statutes, and no article or busines of religion. Nor did the Church make any such constitution by her own autority, but declared only, what secular power may justly do, when they think it expedient and necessary, to prevent further evils. What power have Priests and Byshops over mens estates and lives? But the Emperour and Kings were willing to have it so ordained in that venerable assembly; that with a more plausible colour they might be able to provide for their Kingdoms peace, even in those affairs which they themselvs were to execute, though not to determin. Nor does any King in Christendom think himself any further obliged by that decree, to put such laws in execution, then he shall with his privat councel think fit. And all secular princes, will by the advice of their peers proceed to such penalties, when they pleas, whether any synod decree it or no. Nor is it the wors, if a councel do say that in som cases may be don, which princes in their discretion think expedient.

His 2 ch. from page 7 to 9.

Tells us, that Mr. *Whitby* is here in a trembling

bling ſweat, good Sir, for your faults. *I tremble*, ſaith he, *to conſider that our Author ſhould be ſo imprudent to ſay no more, to call God to witneſs to his ſoul, that he hath ſtudiouſly avoided all caveling diſtortion of texts, &c.* And then he addes with a new feryour, That *all Fathers are miſerably corrupted by you, and allegations moſt diſingeniouſly forged.* And *if it be not ſo*, quoth he, *I will forfeit preſently my life.* Good man, he engages very far, as you ſee, for you. He will dy, dy preſently; if Fathers, all the Fathers, be not corrupted, miſerably corrupted, by you. And this he will do without any trembling, if he do not make that good which he trembles to think of. But it is no wondrous matter I think, to hear him utter ſuch daring words, although he uſe here none of his mental reſervations. He knows himſelf as ſafe as a thief in a mill; and that it will never be put to a Jury, to find whether he be guilty or no.

His firſt chapter was fuming wrath; this ſecond a ſhivering fear: And ſo he proceeds, from one paſſion to another, quite through his book, even to the end, to verifie his own words in his Epiſtle to his Patron, where upon the ſight of your book, he ſaith, that *he found himſelf put into ſuch a paſſion, as vented it ſelf into this reply.* But theſe paſſions of his, and the various vilifications both of your book and perſon, wherewith this reply of his, and aſſault againſt

Catholiks is ſtuft, or any other of his calumnies and bitter invectives againſt Papiſts, which are many and hainous. I ſhall not trouble you with now. You muſt have patience, and let them paſs, as other good people do, where ever you meet them. Miniſters, good men, fight for their wives and children, either thoſe they have or hope to have, which will be undon and loſt, if the odium of Popery, and of all ſuch as any way excuſe and defend their innocence, be not ſmartly kept up. My adverſary OeN did as much to innocent *Fiat Lux*, which had no other fault, but that it had excuſed the faultles. To do well and hear ill, this muſt be the lot, as that is the endeavour of all good men in this world.

In his 3 ch. from page 9. to 17.

The challenge of Biſhop Jewel for the firſt 600 years againſt Papiſts, which all his graver brethren diſliked, Mr. Whitby, if his word here be of any worth, will make it good, yea and enlarge it with Perkins, White, Baxter, and Crackanthorp to 800, yea 1200 years, *wherein there was not*, they ſay, *any ſuch creatur as a Papiſt in the world*. And he cares not a pin, though Beza, Melanćton, and Luther, acknowledg to the contrary, that Popery hath the prerogative of Antiquity, before all other waies. *Beza*, ſaith he, *and Melanćton are ſtrangers to us. Muſt we be accountable for Luthers words?* And

yet

yet all over his book, he makes more use of strangers, & gives more credit to them, then any of our own, and would have us do so too. Are not Chamier, Dally, Plessis, Grotius, Blondel, as much strangers, and of as little credit, as Beza, Melancton, and Luther. But what if our own Dr. *Willet* speaks for the Papists antiquity above others? What if our own *Whitaker* say, that to beleev by the testimony of the Church, is the very heresie of the Papists? O then his answer is ready at hand. *What is all this to the purpos? did ever any Protestant say otherwis? do they therfor confess their antiquity?* The stripling fears no colours. If any or many both of our own and forreign Protestants do acknowledg the Papists antiquity, why, what then? If some deny it, then it is so. It is as they say, who say as he sayes. And if any say otherwise, it is otherwise. It is not so.

Ther is one assertion in this his third chapter, that deservs I think to be written in capital letters. For p. 16. having told you Sir, that *Protestants either affront the evidence of Scripture against Papists, or the intent of the Apostles, or rather of God himself, &c.* he thinks therfor, that Protestants rejection of Popery may well be excused, and *especially*, saith he, (these are his words so much remarkable) *When you Papists know, we hold that in all matters of faith, it is all one with us, to be prater Scripturam, and to be con-*

contra. That is, in plain Engliſh, what is not in Scripture, that Proteſtants hold to be againſt it. And is this ſo?

Firſt, it is hard to ſay, how far matters of faith reach. Ther is one ſort of people now in England, that would have all things acted and diſpoſed even in civil affairs, only according to the tenour of Goſpel. And what is beſide it, they conclude by this very axiom to be againſt it. And ſo they decry all our Courts, our very Juſtices of peace and Conſtables. But in eccleſiaſtical affairs, the proper buſineſſes of the Church, and matters of religion, as diſtinct from civil, this is the plea which the good Quakers uſe againſt the Byſhops and Prieſts, of not only the Roman, but even this our Engliſh Church, which Whitby defends. Why, ſay they to them, why are we harraſſed, impriſoned, beaten and ſpoiled ſo many wayes, by your inſtigation, who have made your ſelves drunk with the blood of Saints? Do not we either confront the evidence of Scriptur againſt you, or the intent of the Apoſtles, or rather of God himſelf, and tell you expreſly, that you oppoſe the evidence of Gods word, in your obſervances and ordinations, in your tythes and Lents, and Maſs-tides, in your lawn ſleeves and caſſocks and canonical girdles, in your Pulpits, Univerſities, and Steeple-houſes, in your Chapters and Deanaries, in your orders and degrees,

in

in your oppreſſions of conſcience and juriſdictions, in your ſurplices, copes, and preaching for hire, &c. Is it not enough to ſhew our innocence, in not accepting theſe things, becaus in the beginning it was not ſo? nor were any of theſe things to be found amongſt the apoſtles. Eſpecially when you know, we hold, and we know alſo you hold, that in matters of faith and religion, it is all one, to be beſide Scriptur, and to be againſt it. Are your Chapters and Deanaries, your lawn ſleeves and ſurplices, your Lents and common-prayers, your tythes and livings of five or ſix hundred a year, your univerſities, and ſteeple-houſes in Scriptur and Chriſtian Goſpel, yea or no? If they be there, ſhew it us. If they are beſides ſcriptur or not in it, then are they by your own confeſſion here, againſt it.

Ch. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. *from p.* 17. *to* 90.

Theſe five following chapters ſpeak againſt *eccleſiaſtical Supremacy*, either amongſt the apoſtles or any other ſucceeding prelates. And with ſo much earneſtnes and little heed doth Mr. *Whitby* whiff away all your defence of it, that he ſtrikes off that authority, not only from the Popes head, but from any Prince or Prelate whatſoever; not caring ſo the Roman fall, if the Engliſh Prelacy ſink too. So earneſt indeed is he bent againſt it, that he profeſſes p. 39. *he would ſooner perſwade himſelf of the truth of Mahomets*

mets fables, then any such pretension. Thus well is he disposed against the coming of the Turk.

These few propositions he advances here amongst others. 1. *That the apostles had an equality of power and jurisdiction or dignity over the rest.* But whence then comes our English Hierarchy, of bishops, arch-bishops, ministers, and deacons? Whitby himself denies, that our Kings are the root of Episcopal jurisdiction here in England; *Who ever thought so,* quoth he, p. 88. I think I could show him out of the statutes and laws of the Land, that our English Episcopacy, and their whole jurisdiction, is from the King, as the sole fountain and root of it. But if it be not so; and no such subordination, as here he affirms, was ever found amongst the apostles, whence is our English Hierarchy? If it neither come from God nor from the King, it may not irrationally be suspected, to be from an insufficient it not an ill original.

His second is, *that such an ecclesiastical jurisdiction is useles, and unable to prevent schismes, whether they rise from breach of charity or difference of judgement,* p. 20. And if it be useles for that, for Gods sake what is it good for? Third is, *that to submit to one, is to slight the judgment of thousands, that may be as wise as he; and to endanger the very being of religion. Ibid.* And is it so indeed? why then are so many millions here in *England* subjected to one Bishop, much

much people to one minister, all the people, ministers, and bishops to one King? Is this to slight all that are subjected, or to endanger the very being of religion. Fourth is, that *general causes cannot be dispatched by one supreme governour over all, as may particular by inferiour superintendents.* And other such like fanatick assertions he has; which do as much evacuate the subordination of our English as the Roman Church, and civil government as well as ecclesiastical hierarchy. I am sure they have done both, even in this our Kingdom, and in our own dayes: a thing which will not be soon forgotten. And little did I think to see any prelatick minister broach such whimsies again here in our land, so lately made desolate thereby. What he means by it I cannot tell. But I am sure he is not so unadvised, but he understands the consequence. For p. 423. upon his grant of a liberty of judging to particular persons, in matters of religion; whence all our wars and animosities here in *England* do first flow, even so far as to deny obedience therupon to their spiritual superiours, he speaks thus: *Would a gracious King, think you, presently condemn all those to the utmost severity, who in such cases after consultation and deliberation duly made, by reason of som prejudices or weaknes of reasoning, should be induced to think it their duty to follow the mutinous party?* he craftily uses the phrase of *utmost*

seve-

severity, the better to palliate his more secret judgment, who by his own principles here and elsewhere not obscurely expressed, must needs conceiv them liable to no severity at all.

But that you may see, Sir, this adversary of yours, what a lively spark he is, he makes in his 5 chapter the very Popes themselvs, when significantly they would express their own supremacy, either to say nothing for it, or altogether against it. If Pope *Agatho* speak of his own solicitude over the Churches of God, even to the utmost bounds of the ocean. Whitby thence infers, that *his headship therfor is not universal, becaus it is bounded.* Is not this witty? And thus the great Prophet, when he describes the vaste unlimited extent of the Messias his dominion (*dominabitur à mari usque ad mare, & à flumine usque ad terminos orbis terrarum*) must be understood to limit and confine it.

Again, if Pope *Julius* defend his acts of power and jurisdiction, by ancient cannons and custom; Whitby concludes from thence, that *it is not therfor of divine institution; for custom and cannons are but humane.* Witty still. Thus a master, when sending his servant on an errand, he tells him he may well go, for that he gave him lately a pair of new shooes, loses therby all his other claim of commanding him.

Again, if St. *Gregory* prefer the Apostolicall

See

See before other Churches. *That is*, quoth Whitby, *not for it ſelf, but for the Emperours ſeat.* And for the ſame reaſon muſt the Byſhop of London or Abbot of Weſtminſter, if any now were, be preferred before the Byſhop of Canterbury.

If Pope *Leo* derive his autority from St. Peter prince of the apoſtles, *That may infer*, quoth he, a *precedency of order, but not any dignity.* A Prince, it ſeems, ſignifies only one that is to go before, not one, that has any dignity or power to command thoſe that follow after. Thus will your adverſary put authorities into his mouth, and draw them in an inſtant, moſt nimbly out of his throat, without ever touching his ſtomack. Can we think him unable, by ſuch Hugonot evaſions, to whiff away all the four goſpels and apoſtles creed, as to its former ſence and meaning, if there ſhould once be a neceſſity urging him to ſubmit to Mahomets fables, or reconcile them and his creed together? Who dare ſay he cannot do it, and do it as wiſely too, as perhaps he ever did thing in his life.

I think it not amiſs Sir, to give you yet a little further taſte here of our Author, your adverſaries nimblenes, only ſom little of much; for I mean to be very breef.

Doth emperour *Valentinian* eſtabliſh, that whatſoever is decreed by the See apoſtolik, which is raiſed upon the merits of St. *Peter*, dig-

dignity of the city, and autority of councels, ſhould have the force of a law to all Byſhops? *Valentinian*, ſaith Whitby, *was a young man and eaſily ſeduced. What doth this conclude for the Popes ſupremacy*, &c. The laws then of Kings and Emperours are to be weighed, it ſeems, by the age of the law-maker. And if he ſhould be a young man, they ſignifie nothing againſt any delinquent or tranſgreſſour, if he have but the wit to plead here with *Whitby*, that the King was young, when that law was made. This eaſily ſeduced young mans law was in force notwithſtanding, in following times, and put into the code by the old mature grave man, and not eaſily ſeduced Emperour Juſtinian: And no man either young or old ever excepted againſt it, for the youth of the legiſlator. Young Princes do not make laws as boyes tell tales, only by ſtrength of their own wits. Valentinian was a young man, and his laws therfor, according to Whitby, not to be regarded: And what then ſhall we think of our Engliſh proteſtancy, which was here firſt publikly ſet up by King Edward the ſixt, a child.

Doth an eccleſiaſtical cannon ſay, that no decree can be eſtabliſhed in the Church, without the aſſent of the Roman byſhop. *That is*, quoth Whitby, *except the Roman Byſhop be preſent. What doth this make for ſupremacy? &c.* But if he have no autority there, why may he not

not as well be abſent. There is no certain number required for the making of a decree; and that byſhop does no more, it ſeems, then make up a number.

Doth the councel of Epheſus refer the judgment of the Patriarch of Antioch his caus to the Pope? for that the Church of Antioch had been ever governed by the Roman. *That was*, ſaith Whitby, *not to uſe his autority, but only to know his mind, &c.* And what matters it, I pray, what his mind may be, if the others never mean to heed it. We conſult any that are preſent, whether equal or inferiours, to know their minds, and yet do our ſelves what we liſt: but we never trouble men a thouſand miles off for that. Surely when a judgment is referred by parties to another power ſo far diſtant, with great expence and long expectation, and only upon this ground, that they are ſubject, and have ever been governed by that power, they cannot be thought only to require his mind, but uſe his authority. Our honeſt Quaker will not be unwilling thus to have his caus referred to the judgment of our Engliſh Biſhops, not to uſe their authorities, but only to know their minds.

Doth the Sardican councel ordain, that in a controverſie between byſhops, Appeal ſhould be made to the Byſhop of Rome, to appoint Judges, and renew the proces. *That cannon,*

sayes he, *is against the Papists; for it permits the Pope to receiv, not to command appeals, &c.* So then: Papists, it seems, think the Pope may command, not receiv appeals. *And besides*, saith he, *the appellation was there ordained ad Julium Romanum, not ad Papam Romanum: Not to the Pope who then was Julius; but to Julius who then was Pope.* We have here surely another Hudibras; *In logick a great critick, profoundly skilled in Analytick; he can distinguish and divide a hair 'twixt South and South-West side.* Appeal to Julius Pope, not to Pope Julius! And what does he think to gain by this subtilty? The cannon he hopes will ceas forsooth, when Julius dies. O the wit of some men above other some, especially when it is assisted by French Hugonots who drink good wine. Our English ale could never have made us out so subtil a distinction as this is.

Doth the councel of *Arles* send their decrees to the Bishop of Rome, from whom all Christians are to receiv what to beleev and practis? *Here is somthing of trouble*, quoth Whitby, *but nothing of jurisdiction in the Pope, &c.* Can any thing hang more tight then this? Conciliar decrees must be sent to Rome, from whence all Christians must receiv what they are either to beleev or practis. But this is not to acknowledg his power, but to trouble his patience.

Doth St. Basil say, it is convenient to write

to

to the bishop of Rome to conclude affairs, δῆναι γνώμην and to pass his sentence? O, quoth he, δῆναι γνώμην, *doth not signifie to give sentence, but advice.* Here you have a spice of his grammer to mix with his logick; γνώμη signifies counsel, and βῆμα is greek for a juridical sentence.

Doth Athanasius fly to Rome against the Eusebians, and Pope Julius appoint a day in his behalf εἰς δίκην, for plea and judgment, τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπομένῳ νόμῳ, following therein the law and method of the Church. *He followed that law,* saith Whitby, *not in citing them, but in not condemning them uncited. &c.* He was just then, in not condemning parties uncited. But by what authority he either cited or judged them, we must not here know. Is ther any law of the Church, that justifies a condemnation of persons cited to judgment, when they are neither cited nor judged by any legal autority? And it is to be observed here, Sir, all this while, and quite through his book, that Whitby has forgot the fearful execration he made upon himself in the beginning, *that all fathers are miserably corrupted by you, and allegations most disingeniously forged, &c.* This I say he has quite forgot, even so far forgot, that there is not one autority in a hundred, that he does so much as challenge either of forgery or corruption. And is therfor in danger to forfeit presently his life. But he

was then in his own heat, now he is amongſt his Proteſtant authors, who afford him other kind of evaſions. And we muſt leav him to their wits, when he has loſt his own memory.

Doth S. Auguſtin witnes, that the caus of the Donatiſts in Africa was judged by Pope Melchiades in Rome. *This was*, ſaith Whitby, *a brotherly, not an authorative deciſion.* I make no doubt it was brotherly, but why not authorative? Mr. Whitby hath ſeen perhaps ſom elderly cockerel, to part the frayes of younger chickens; and thinks tribunals of byſhops do no more. The Pope, it ſeems, was ever a loving brother at leaſt, ſtill ready to decide the frayes of all Churches and Byſhops upon all occaſions; which was a pious and good work, and not belonging to Antichriſt. He would do well Sir, to part this fray of yours with Mr. Whitby, which otherwis will never be ended.

Is the Roman Patriarch ſaid, to have the care of all the Churches? *Any one*, ſaith Whitby, *may have that repute; for he that ſerves one Church ſerves all.* And if Whitby get but the cure of any one little Chappel here in England, though it be but to read prayers in an hoſpital, he muſt then be beleeved to have the ſolicitude of all the Engliſh Churches upon him.

In brief, doth S. *Chryſoſtom*, to declare a ſupremacy among the apoſtles, affirm, that St. James obtained the throne of Jeruſalem, but

St.

St. Peter was constituted master and teacher, not of one throne, but of the whole world, τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος. *That text*, sayes he, *is in all likelihood by negligence of transcribers, or som other way, mistaken. However it makes nothing for supremacy: were not all the apostles so?* He gathers they were all so, becaus the peculiarity of the title, *master and teacher of the whole world*, is there attributed unto one, exclusively to all the rest. Every minister is a byshop or overseer, if we mind only the signification of the word, but is he therfor so in the whole meaning and peculiarity of the title?

Finally, doth our Mr. Whitgift acknowledg, that the apostles were all equal as to their function, not as to government; equal *quoad ministerium*, not *quoad polititiam*; which is a plain and manifest assertion, Sir, of the supremacy you plead for? *What is this*, saith Whitby *to the purpos?* He findes never a word in that speech of Dr. *Whitgift*, which begins with s. u. p. and therfor cries out, What is this to the purpos? what is this to supremacy?

You must not expect, Sir, that in the succeeding chapters, I should give you any more account of the particular quicknesses of your adversary. They are all like these which I have here briefly hinted to you in this first controverted point of Supremacy; only that you may see, that he, or the several champions rather,

which he makes use of, have more distinctions than one. But by such evasions, distinctions, and shifts, wherewith most men are now made so acquainted, that they can use them nimbly against any laws and authorities either divine or humane, are the people of our distressed Kingdom carried up and down, like a cork in water, or gossimor in the air, with every wind and billow of a fancy, now here, now there, being removed once from their ancient stability, unto endles disquiet. Cannot a man in this manner and method, evacuate, slight, and frustrate every thing? What authority, law, or custom, either human or divine, can stand in force, if it may be thus by Whitbean Sophomorismes laughed out of countenance? I will be bold to say, that the witty Presbyterian does more substantially refute all prelatick principles and practices, then these answer the Roman. Nay these in answering the Roman, have made way for the Presbyterian: And yet they will still be scribling.

But you must know Sir withall, that Mr. Whitby in his intervals or cooler moods, allows the Roman Patriarch, a priority of order and honour, although he will not afford him any autority or jurisdiction. A πρωτοκλισία, or uppermost seat he shall have, although no supremacy or power. For he sayes p. 52. *The bysbop of Rome was to do it,* (judg causes he means, receiv appeals, and the like) *more especially for the*

the dignity of his seat, which made him prime in order of Byshops. And again p. 66. *St. Basil calling the Byshop of Rome* Δύσεως κορυφὴν, *the head or apex of Western Byshops, makes him only,* saith he, *the chief in order, and most eminent Byshop of the West, which title we can very well allow him.* So that the Pope, if he should come hither to us, either for love or hospitality, although our byshops will not allow him authoratively to visit, keep chapter, make laws, or punish any of them for transgressing the ecclesiastical cannons, yet will they give him a πρωτοκαθεδρία, and suffer him, if Mr. Whitby be any legal master of ceremonies, to sit at the upper end of the table. And St. *Peter*, it seems, had no more. Nor had he any power, so much as to command any man to rise from the table; if he behaved himself unmannerly at his meat.

And such a precedency he allows his own chief Superiour, the Arch-byshop of Canterbury; and no more. *A Metropolitan,* saith he, p. 23. *hath no jurisdiction over byshops: He can do nothing, &c.* And again page 33. *His grace of Canterbury hath no power of jurisdiction over byshops.* And this he speaks boldly; although he assert withall, that a byshop hath jurisdiction over parish-priests, and these over their parishioners. So that according to Whitby, that autority, dignity, and power which is in the lowest, must be wanting in the highest degree of

hierarchy, which muſt, if this be true, end with power, and begin with feebleneſs; contrary both to common reaſon, and that famous ſpeech of learned Porphyry, *In ſummis eſt unitas cum virtute, in infimis multitudo cum debilitate.* Mr. Whitby has no hope perhaps ever to be made Metropolitan, although he may poſſibly ſee himſelf a byſhop; and will not therfor deveſt himſelf aforehand, of the dignity he may one time or other arrive at, although the fox call the grapes, he has no hopes to reach, unſavory and ſowre ſtuff.

But his grace of Canterbury, hath he no juriſdiction, Mr. Whitby, over byſhops? What law, cuſtom, or tradition gives byſhops a power over pariſh-prieſts, which allows not a Metropolitan as much over byſhops? And if he have only a precedency of place, then can theſe have no more: And it is as eaſie to ſay the one, as the other. And is all our hierarchy com only to a precedency of honour? Here will be fine work for a Quaker, who will as reſolutely deny the honour, as you the power. How coms that eminent perſon to be ſtiled his *grace of Canterbury*, but only for his power, dignity, and juriſdiction over the venerable byſhops? And this power and dignity hath, I am ſure, belonged to the See of Canterbury ever ſince the firſt planting of Chriſtianity among the Engliſh, which inables that byſhop to make laws, to viſit his

his province, to call together his byshops, to censure, to punish even Prelates themselves, if they transgress the cannons: which is as much as any byshop can do to his parish priests. Is it not a strange presumption in a young man, thus to disable his own chief prelate before his face, and say peremptorily, that a Metropolitan can do nothing; that his grace of Canterbury hath no jurisdiction. I know, and am fully assured, ther is not one of those poor catholik priests who were lately banished out of England, but would have defended even to extremity, if need were, this one most certain verity, That a Metropolitan hath a jurisdiction, as solid and good a jurisdiction over byshops, as any these can have or plead for over parish priests. And by as firm and good and ancient law is the one established as the other, and indeed by the very same; whilst a minister of his own presumes to tell the Arch-byshop his own prelate to his face, that he hath no jurisdiction at all.

His 9 ch. from page 91. to 169.

Is wholly fanatick. There he tells us plainly, That *neither Convocations, Byshops, nor Parliaments are judges of our faith*: That *the English Church doth not punish for difference in opinions, nor require that all should beleev as she beleevs, or submit to her determinations, but leaves every man to the liberty of his own judgment, so he do not make factions against her. Who ever urged men,*

saith

saith he, *to beleev as the Church beleevs?* p. 101. Also, that *no decrees of any Church are further to be admitted, then they appear to particular mens judgments to agree with scriptur.* That *every private man must make use of his own reason, to judg or reject doctrin and rites propounded, though scriptur be his guide.* That *the business must there end, without resigning to any further authority, which is all as fallible as we be our selves:* That *points fundamental are as perspicuous as the sunbeam, and points not fundamental, the Church doth not determin them; and if any dispute should rise about them, she silences indeed, but expects not her children should be of her opinion, only would not have them gainsay her:* That *that Church does but mock us, which expects a beleef to her proposals, becaus she pretends to guide her self by scriptur. For if scriptur must bend to their decrees, and we must have no sence of scriptur, but what they think fit, then their decrees and not scriptur is our last rule:* And *it is a pretty devise,* quoth he, *first to rule the rule, and then be ruled by it, &c.* Can a good Quaker say more for himself, or desire more to be said for him. If we be not bound to beleev, we are not bound to hear. Nay, we are bound not to hear any such Church, lest we should chance to beleev what aforehand we condemn, and they themselvs dare not justifie.

He hath much of this talk up and down in his book; *Faith,* saith he p. 439. *cannot be compelled.*

pelled. *By taking this liberty of discretion from men, we force them to becom hypocrits, and so profess outwardly what inwardly they disbeleev.* And again p. 450. *We allow not any man openly to contradict the Churches decrees. But when he thinks contrary to the determination of our Church, he must keep his judgment to himself, only refusing obedience with all humility, till he be better informed.* No fanatick will desire to refuse obedience any longer.

Thus doth this champion deliver up himself and Church, unto the will and disposal of all whatever sects; and cares not, so he may avoid catholik obeysance, to make himself a prey to those, who upon these grounds here laid down, will soon turn him out of Church and pulpit too, and strip him not only of his cloak, but his coat also.

At last he answers the catholik arguments for the Churches assured and infallible guidance, just as he did before your others for supremacy. Seeing him there, you see him every where.

Finally he brings in, for a certain testimony of the Churches liability to errour, the two opinions so rife in old time, about communicating infants, and the Millenaries thousand years of blessedness with Christ in this world, after dooms-day: *Which are both of them now condemned*, saith he, *by a contrary beleef and practice of the present Church, although they were held*

held by not a few very antient Fathers in the primitive times. And in this he triumphs exceedingly. Surely without caus I should think. Those primitive doctors, we may be assured, knew something more then their Catechism, and committed to writing, something of that they conceived, beyond their Christian faith, as well as the present Fathers and Doctors of the Church now do. And if there were so great varieties of opinion among them concerning those two things, as there are now adayes among catholik doctors about a thousand others, it is a sign that those two points did not belong to their Catechisme of faith, then assuredly known, but only to scholastical Theology, especially sith they had neither clear scriptur or general councel, nor assured tradition for either side.

And it is of no moment, that som of them should be so confident of their opinion, as to think it to be a right firm Christian beleef. For so I have heard my self, many a school Divine in catholik countreys, to say of his *Thesis* or school position, the better to countenance his own divinity, that it was either faith or very near it. Besides I do not know, that the present Church hath ever declared, in any cannon of her faith, either that the faithfull shall not reign upon earth a thousand years with Christ, after dooms-day: or that we may not communicate the Eucharist to children; although

though this last is declared not necessary.

His 10 ch. from page 169. to 180.

Is against prayer for the dead and Purgatory. Where, both by the testimonies which you, Sir, do cite in your book, and by the authorities he brings himself, Mr. *Whitby* acknowledges that praying and offering for the dead is a very ancient and general custom amongst Christians. Nay, that S. Paul himself prayed for his deceased friend Onesiphorus: This I say he plainly grants p. 182. But he addes, that *all this does not infer Purgatory*, or that *Purgatory is a place under ground near hell, where is fire and darknes, or that all are in pain and torments there.* And so he pusles to the end of his chapter; acknowledging faith, and denying only theology. For whether Purgatory signifie any one place, as our imagination is apt to fancy, or only a state and condition of som souls departed out of this visible world, I see Mr. Whitby understands not, that it is no Christian faith, but a meer scholastical divinity. But that our prayers, offerings, penances, and good deeds, do benefit the souls deceased; this the very testimonies cited by Mr. Whitby himself, as they do sufficiently evince, so do they confirm catholik faith, though they touch not upon theology at all. And so while he oppugns the divinity of som catholiks, he establishes the catholik faith of all Divines.

In

In the interim he ought to remember, although in this he often forgets himself, that by the very testimonies, not only which you Sir do bring for Purgatory, but those also which Mr. *Whitby* has against it, we may see manifestly, that our Protestant Church hath much swerved from the ancient primitive practice of former Christians. For Protestants have neither priests, nor altars, nor offerings, nor sacrifice, nor satisfactions, nor expiations for the dead, which those authorities speak of.

Ch. 11. *from page* 188. *to* 203.

The real presence under the elements of the Eucharist, Mr. *Whitby* here will not by any means endure. And he hath one shield of a word, which consists of almost as many syllables, as *Ajax* his buckler of bulls hides, to repell all autorities that may witness it. *Representatively*, that is the word. Thou seest, saith St. Chrisostom, upon the altar the very body which the wise-men saw and worshipped. *Representatively*, saith Whitby. Again, The most precious thing in heaven I will shew thee upon earth, saith the same father. It is *shewed representatively*, saith Whitby; it is seen representatively. I dare not adore the earth, saith St. Augustin, and yet I have learned how the earth is to be adored; becaus flesh is of the earth, and our Lord gave us his flesh to eat, which no man eats except he first adore. *It is Christ*, saith Whitby,

who

who is adored representatively. And if any words will not bear that distinction, then are they all spurious. Nay, if any should say expressly, that not only Christ in heaven, but his very Sacrament is worshipped, this man will tells us presently, who hath as many shifts in readiness, where one will not serv his turn, as Achelous had to slip out of the hands of Hercules, that προσκύνω and *adoro* have other significations.

But he has, poor man, no very good memory. For after he had in this one chapter, spent many of his pages, to show that the real presence was not the former faith of Christians, and that they never adored the Eucharist, he lets fall a word by chance in the very close, which spoils all, by giving us to understand, that this was so universal a beleef and practis among Christians, that it came even to the notice of Infidels; and that it was withall of so great concernment amongst beleevers, that it expressed their whole religion, as the abridgment of their faith, and great capital work of their devotion. *Quandoquidem Christiani adorant quod comedunt, sit anima mea cum Philosophis.* It was the speech of Avicen, saith Whitby, although I think it was Averroes, who well enough understood both of them the natur of Christian religion, not only by what they saw themselves, but what they had read from more ancient writers, both Chri-

Christian, pagan, and Mahometan up and down the world, concerning the religion of Christians. *Since the Christians worship that which they eat,* saith that Infidel, *let my soul be with Philosophers.*

Ch. 12. *from page* 203. *to* 218.

Labours much for the general use of the Cup in all Communions. But neither does Mr. Whitby, nor can he distinguish, as appears by his discours, wherein he sayes, that *otherwise ther would not be a representation of Christs death,* which is the wisest word he speaks in all this whole chapter; I say he knows not, and cannot distinguish, that ther is in that one Eucharistian liturgy a double action, the one of sanctifying and offering to God, the other of giving or communicating to the people. In the sanctifying and offering of the sacred simbols does only the sacrifice, which is a representation of Christs death, consist. But the communicating of these symbols to the people, is only a consequent of the former, and no formal representation of our Lords death at all. But he does not know, and you need not heed what he sayes.

The concomitance of our Lords body and blood, where ever it be in any one or other of the species or symbols, which may enough justifie communion in one kinde, he tells you very roundly, *it is a figment.* But if he had heeded the very practis of his own Church, which indeed

indeed he never does, he would have forborn those words. For when the Protestant minister gives the people first the bread, and sayes, *Take, and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed upon him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving*; Do not the ministers words there imply a concomitance before the cup come; even as perfect a concomitance, as you Sir can plead for? I think they do. For surely they intend not, to feed only upon one half of him.

Chap. 13. *from page* 218 *to* 230.

Declares, that alms-deeds and preaching of the Gospel is a sacrifice. But the Eucharist he will not allow to be any true sacrifice at all. Although to put by your arguments and solid reasonings for it, he grants it may be called a *Symbolical* sacrifice. And so he has caught hold of another distinction, which runs quite through this matter; or rather put the same distinction into other characters. And if any ancient writers, as ther are enough, do give testimony, that our Lords body and blood in the Eucharist is offered, immolated, and sacrificed on Christian altars, by the priest, for our attonement; *It is to be understood*, saith Whitby, *to be offered symbolically*, immolated symbolically, sacrificed symbolically, figuratively, signifieatively, representatively. And though you beat his head never so much with your autorities and reasons, so long

as *symbolically* remains there, you do but beat the air.

But where are any altars in our English Churches, or any sacrifices offered, or immolated theron? And how comes it to pass, that all these hundred years of our separation from Roman unity, our people have never been told, that they have priests still amongst them, and altars, and sacrifice, although they be but symbolical ones; symbolical sacrifice, symbolical altars, and symbolical priests. For sacrifice is the very form and essence of all religion. And they that know so much, would have been much satisfied, to hear, that they have yet a sacrifice, at least a symbolical sacrifice amongst them. I will be bold to say, that not one man of a million has ever heard of any such thing in an English pulpit, or ever read it in a catechism. The minister of the word and word of the minister, that is all we ever hear of. But it is thought perhaps, that *symbolical Priest* would make but a jarring sound, like two voices in a defective octave, which have a semblance and shadow of a perfect concord, but coming short of it, produce the harshest and worst of discords in our ear.

That our Lords death upon the Cross was a true and real sacrifice to God for mankinde, all Catholiks know well enough, and our Ministers need not put them in minde of that, which already

already they believe. But as the sacrifices of the old law were instituted by almighty God, to be often iterated, before the passion of the great Messias, for a continual exercise of religion, in order to his future death: So did the same Lord, for the very same purpos of religious exercise, institute another to be iterated after his death, unto which once past, it was to have reference, as the former had a relation to the same death and passion when it was to com. And this the very gospel, if we would but understand it by the ancient practis of the Church, which interprets all written words, sufficiently declares.

And though this great sacrifice be exhibited in Eucharistian species and symbols, yet do all Fathers and ancient Councels speak clearly, that it is a real, true, and propitiatory sacrifice, though accompanied also with a figur, and not only a figurative and symbolical one. A child may be the figur of his father, and yet is he not rightly said to be only a figurative and symbolical child. A sacrifice only symbolical, a figurative altar, and representative priesthood, make only a symbolical, figurative and representative religion.

Chap. 14. *from page* 230 *to* 247.

Rejects images and sacred figures, as both useles and sinful: And Mr. *Whitby* seems here (good Sir pardon me) to have got indeed a real

vantage over you. Doubtles you were somwhat overseen, when you wrote in your book, most advised in other things and serious, these ill pondered words to Protestants. *Were there represented to any of you, thinking of other matters, a pictur of our Lord hanging upon a Cross, could you possibly avoid the calling to mind, who our Lord was, and what he hath done and suffered for you? &c.* And again, *Ask your heart, and you will find, that you would not place St. Peters pictur or the Kings in an unclean place, &c.* I say you are to blame, Sir, to think men of that way so scrupulous, or prone to devotion. For *Whitby* confutes you by an evident demonstration. *Alas,* quoth he, *I see every day Crucifixes in our Colledg windows, and yet never find any such effect wrought in me, as you talk of.* Indeed neither those Colledges, nor windows in the colledges, nor Crucifixes in the windows, were ever set up by their good Catholik founders, for any such students, as *Whitby* is, who findes, it seems, no effect wrought in him there, by the sight of any thing, but his good chamber, distributions, and dinner provided for him in the hall.

So likewise the connatural respect you plead for, as due to figures by force of their representation of respected persons, by an example of a Kings pictur, he confutes it nimbly. *I would not fear,* quoth Whitby, *to tear his Majesties picturs, which sometimes may be found in smoaky Ale-*

Alehouſes, &c. he puts them in ſmoaky Alehouſes, the better to cover his own rudenes; *nor would I ſcruple,* ſayes he, *to put a piece of Popiſh Maſs, wherin were haply an Epiſtle or Goſpel extant, unto an unclean uſe.* And here alſo, he puts the Goſpel in a Maſs-book, as before he ſet the Kings pictur in a ſmoaky alehouſe, to prevent offence, that ſom tender one amongſt themſelvs, might take at his uncivil talk.

In brief, he will not allow any figur or image, though it were a Crucifix, to have any influence upon our minds unto good thoughts, any more then the *pictur of Bradſhaw or Cromwell, hell or the devil.* Somtimes he ſayes they caus bad thoughts, but never any good ones. And yet he addes, *that Proteſtants do keep up picturs notwithſtanding, though the cries of fanaticks be never ſo loud againſt them, becaus of the hiſtorical uſe they have.* What hiſtorical uſe can they have, in the name of God, if the ſight of them, as *Whitby* himſelf here ſpeaks, can bring no part of ſacred hiſtory to our minds; nor the very Crucifix have ſo much influence upon us, as to mind us who our Lord was, or what he hath don or ſuffered for us,? Unles he will ſay, according to his uſual method of anſwering, that they bring into our minds the hiſtory of the civil wars betwixt Ceſar and Pompey. But ſurely, if theſe kind of ſacred images and figures caus only evil thoughts, and no good ones, the

cry of fanaticks against them, notwithstanding any historical use, which according to Whitby, although he talk of it, is none at all, will not be judged unjust.

In conclusion he will needs have the Papists both to worship their Images, and pray to them. And this, becaus they use them commonly in their Oratories, whither they retire from places of worldly busines, to recollect themselvs, and pray, when time and devotion invites them to it. But if for this the Papist must suffer his doom, what will *Whitby* say, when he shall be accused himself, for worshipping the roof and rafters of the Church, towards which he casts up his eyes, when he stands in his pulpit to pray, before and after his sermon. Even the poor Jews were derided by the Roman Satyrist, as adorers of the Welkin and clouds. And who can escape the censur, whether he have som pious representation before him, to fix his fancy, or turn only to the wall and stones. He must still kneel before somthing, whether he be within door, or without in the open air. And if he have the assistance of his crucified redeemer represented before him, it is probable enough it may help to recollect his mind, to humble his spirit, and fix his fancy; at least it can do no hurt. And if I may and needs must frame an idea or pictur of him in my mind, why may I not have it in mine eye too?

But

But Mr. Whitby will have it, whatever you, or the whole world knows to the contrary, that *Papists pray to picturs, and consequently make a God of them.* And he will not have them any more excusable, *then those Israelites who worshipped God in a Calf.* Here Sir I learn what I never knew before, that the idolatrous Israelites worshipped God in a calf. He that shall worship a calf for God, I could never in my life yet conceiv how he should worship God in a calf. Moses worshipped God in a flaming bush. And why? Becaus God was by a peculiar presence in that bush or flame, to terminate that worship. Nor was he blamable in worshipping God so present there. But God was not so present in that golden statue of the molten heifer, which the Hebrews had set up in Moses absence, as the very God which brought them out of Egypt, that they could be said to worship God in it. And if he had been so present in it, they might surely as well have fallen down before him there, as any where els. The heathen, whom the holy Prophet rebuked so earnestly for worshipping the stars and host of heaven, did they also worship God in the stars or heavens? surely then they were not blame-worthy. Where ever God is by a peculiar presence, as in heaven and Moses his flame, there may and ought he to be worshipped. And so Christians worshipped God even in the man Jesus, our great and blessed Lord.

But his figur or effigies has no more of Gods presence in it, then the wall it hangs upon; save only the reflection of his outward effigies, to recollect the fancy. And the respect, if we will speak properly, does not terminate upon the pictur, but upon the person whom it represents; which infers a worship of God in it, not by it.

Chap. 15. from page 247 to 273.

Is very earnest for scriptur and liturgy in a vulgar tongue. This plea of Protestant ministers makes a plausible sound. And they know it well enough. For it was the first thing that by their rhetorical colours cast upon it, commended them to the people, after the Apostacy of the first reformers; by whose perswasion, the people was then made to beleev, they should now be as gods, all of them, knowing good and evil. *The word of God*, saith Whitby, *is kept from the knowledge of the vulgar people in the Roman Church.* And thus they all say and ever will say; be they never so much satisfied by Catholik writers to the contrary: becaus it is to their own advantage it should be so thought in England, and all other places, where Protestants have invaded, and now actually sit upon the Catholick Clergies benefice and byshoppricks.

But is ther any part or particle of Christian faith or religion, or of the word of God, that is

is kept from Catholiks, or not made known to them, in Books, Catechiſmes, Sermons, all in their own language, and in daily practis of that Church, wherof they are members? Do they not hear, and read, and ſee all the myſteries of our Chriſtian faith, Chriſt our Lords birth and paſſion, reſurrection and aſcenſion into glory? what he acted, what he ſuffered, what he taught, what he conſtituted and ordained for our ſalvation; what we are to hope, what to beleev, what to practice in order thereunto, ſet before their eyes, not only by continual ſermons, made to them, all over the catholik world, in their own vulgar tongue, but by their Goſpels and Epiſtles, which they have lying by them, collected for the cours of the whole year, and tranſlated into their own language, together with ſeveral pious treatiſes, and meditations upon all theſe rules and myſteries of faith, unto ſo ample uſe, that if they do but walk accordingly, which is all that religion intends, they cannot miſs ſalvation. Is not all this Gods word? It is nothing els. And what is ther more of the word of God, except we will count letters and ſyllables? The word of God then is not kept from the knowledg of the vulgar people in the Roman Church.

But *why have they not the Bible tranſlated, as it lies, in all languages, where catholik faith is profeſt?* Becaus it is obſcure as it lies, in that ſhort

and

and ambiguous phraſe, and under ſo many ſeveral tropes of rhetorick, and ſchemes alſo of logick, wherin it was wrote, apt therby to be perverted and miſunderſtood, as we ſee by experience to be true, unto endles factions. Nor does the word of God conſiſt ſo much in letters and ſyllables, as in the marrow and meaning of his will. And not the ſence and meaning, but the letter of the ſcriptur is that which makes hereticks.

But *is not that the word of God which is kept from the people?* It is the word of God, but not kept from the people. For it is but the ſame with that, which is delivered and made known unto the people. So much as it contains, whatever it be either of faith or morality, either of what is to be beleeved, or hoped, or practiſed, they have it all; but diſintangled from thoſe artificiall ſchemes of logick and rhetorick, wherof the holy writ is fuller then any book was ever writ by man, which there inwrap and render it obſcure. Ther is no inſtruction, no rule of piety, no particle of comfort, either for this world or the other, in St. Pauls epiſtles, for example, but Catholiks have it; they read it in their own language, if they be able to read, they know it all. And they have it in a better and more facil manner, then they could find it out, by peruſing thoſe high theological diſcourſes of his, which the learnedſt of men can hard-

hardly, and very hardly understand. The like I say of other portions of holy writ. Only the disputative part, with the interwoven systems of rhetorick, this may exercise great and more sublime divines, who by help of their various litterature may consider, not only the plain truths therin contained, which are common to them with other vulgar beleevers, but the nature of the Metonymies, Synechdoche's, Metaphors, together with the several modes of argumentation, refutation, objections and inopinate transitions in the context. This, if my adversary OeN had understood, it had saved one fourth part of his *Animadversions* upon *Fiat Lux*; and *Whitby* here had been utterly silent. But it is their only advantage both in this and other controverted points of faith with Roman Catholiks, either to be ignorant, or dissemble their knowledg. And therfor I have good reason to think, they will never seem to understand. But God grant they may.

The wonder is, that English Protestants should still be as fiercely eager in this point, when they write controversies, as ever they were; when they do themselves most heartily repent, (I have heard several great clergy-men amongst them speak it) that they had ever given the Bible in that short ambiguous phrase it is penned, into the hands of people in their own tongue, to be thus perverted, as it is, every one his

his own way, unto endles and irreconcilable schismes. It would glad their hearts, no doubt, to see the Roman Church do indiscreetly as they have don. But that will never be.

Holy catholik Church has revealed, translated, and several wayes made known the will of God to her people, appointing most divine wayes and methods, such as she had her self received from God, to inure and keep them in the practis of that their holy faith. And the disputative and sublimer divinity, or, as I may so speak, the philosophical part of holy writ, such as can may read on Gods name, and the Church will commend them for it; while these, with all the rest, attend unto those duties and good works, every one in his calling, which their holy faith prescribes.

These are and ever were the wayes and method of the now present and ancient catholik Church, most wise and holy. And her subjects and beleevers have profited therby, many thousands of them, unto angelical sanctity, and all of them unto somthing more, than otherwise they would have had: whilst others that swerv from these wayes, promote themselvs unto wildness and schisme without end, missing indeed the word of God in the very scripture they read, and never attaining to the true life and power in that form of words, which they use not, unto intended sanctification, but by their own mis-

misinterpretations wrest and deprave daily unto their own destruction. Nor will people be ruled now by their ministers, but thinking it their own right to interpret as they pleas, make it their only work to read, and cant sentences, and coin opinions as they list.

Excepting only this one fruit of our vulgar reading of scripture, as it lies, which in all mens judgments is an evil fruit, I do not see, nor can I know, what our Protestants can have, if all other things were equal, above vulgar Catholiks by their scriptur translated, as it lies, in its own phrase. Do they know any more of the mysteries of salvation, Sacraments, or hopes of a life to com, or sincerity of a pious life, then the other? I am sure they do less, whatever they know, and are so taught to do. Or does any Protestant, after he has read a chapter, know any more of what is expedient for salvation, then before he began it. *It renews*, you will say, *and moves devotion*. Devotion to what? Are they not taught by the Reformation, that the good works there commended to our practis, are all mortal sins? And therfor do our people so read and hear, that in hearing and reading they wholly acquiesce, and trouble themselvs no further. And they do wisely in it. For who would chastise his body, or mortifie his appetites, or give alms, and sin so many wayes, with so much expences and trouble, when he

he may as well do nothing, and ſin leſs. And do not the ſacred goſpels, which Catholiks read in their own language, with pious meditations annexed for that very purpos, which alſo they are taught to read for no other end, move devotion too? And this I judg to be right piety. Whereas to read, only to ſay that I have read, or to find out new ways, or ſtrengthen my ſelf therin, is but vanity and ſin.

After a duty is once known, Catholiks conceiv then no further thing remains, but only their correſponding practis, which is with all their forces to be put in ure, according to the dictates of that their rule of faith, now ſufficiently underſtood, unto their ſanctification and merit. Whilſt others think nothing behind, but only to read over again what they knew before, that they may have words in their head to talk of. Which of theſe is right Chriſtianity, he knew well enough who ſaid, *Fidelis ſermo, & de his volo te confirmare, ut curent bonis operibus præeſſe qui credunt Deo*: It is a faithful ſaying, and of this I would have you to be ſtrongly confirmed, that ſuch as once have beleeved in God, attend unto good works: Theſe things are good and profitable to men, but other queſtions, controverſies, and contentions, (which are the only fruit of our vulgar reading of ſcriptur in its own ſhort ambiguous phraſe) theſe do thou avoid; for they are uſeles and vain.

vain. This is St Pauls mind, and I think he had the Spirit of God in him.

As for the sacred liturgy which Mr. *Whitby* would also have in a vulgar tongue, if he knew what the *Messach* or *Catholick Liturgy* is, which here I do not intend to teach him, he would know that it could no more be understood in English then in Hebrew, Latine or Greek. For in it the Priest does but offer and pray submissively for the peoples attonement, unto him who equally understands all languages; and people offer with him, as they are taught, and know well enough to do, all their several necessities, either with words or without them, in the mediation of his blood, who reconciled the world in his flesh to God, which reconciliation is figured and repeated in their Messach, for their religious exercise and comfort. And the great capital work of a true religion ought to be common unto all, not to those only who hear, and speak, and see, but even to the deaf and blind and dumb; how ever these may fail in other inferiour and less necessary duties.

Ch. 16. *from p.* 273. *to* 369.

Maintains very stoutly, first, *that the Saints and Angels of God do not pray for us in heaven, either in general or in particular*: Secondly, *that they do not assist, help or protect us by their presence on earth.* And thirdly, *that to trust to any such help, is to rest in them, as our final end, and to make them*

them our Gods. Though the two firſt be as much diſſonant to any true religion, as the laſt to reaſon; yet will Mr. *Whitby* hold them all three. And he has an evaſion for any grounds or reaſonings you or any Catholik can make; an evaſion at hand as ſmart and ſenceles, as any of thoſe he gave before againſt Supremacy, &c.

But this your catholik doctrin about Angels he buts and runns at it, with moſt frightful and horned dilemma's. *So many millions of Angel-guardians,* quoth he, *if for example upon the feſtival of St. Peter, they go up to heaven to St. Peter with their pupils prayers, who guards their perſons? And if they do not go up, who preſents their prayers?* Again, *When,* ſaith he, *theſe Angel meſſengers com ſo may thouſand of them at once to tell the Virgin Mary of her new ſuitors, how can ſhe have any quiet to ſay her prayers? And if ſhe ſay her own prayers quietly, how can they tell her continually of ſo many new ſuitors?* Again, *Have all the houſes in London, and all the Papiſt houſes in Rome, ſo many Angels as will guard them, and keep the Devil from ſetting them on fire, or not? If they have, then are the Angels finely employed: If they have not, why doth not the enemy ſet a fire on them every night?* Again, *Had Jobs cammels, oxen and aſſes ther Angel-guardian, or no? If not, why then did Satan complain he could not com at them? If they had, then muſt we allow our Author Mr. Creſſy one.* Is not this notable divinity?

Surely

Surely *Hudibras* was but an ass to *Whitby*. This this is the man of whom the poet sings *Canto* 1. This is he, *In school divinity as able, As he that height irrefragable, A second Thomas, or at once, To name them all another Duns.* But all this countrey divinity Mr. *Whitby* gathered, I know well enough, *à sensibilibus*, from the natur and property of his serving-boy, who cannot go of an errand and stay too; cannot sup and blow together; cannot tell a tale and whistle both at once; cannot speak of Jobs asses, but he must remember Mr. Cressy.

In truth, though Mr. *Whitby* be thus extravagant, yet can I not perswade my self, that other graver Protestants are so likewise. For when Christ our Lord comforts his poor beleevers, and terrifies their oppressing adversaries, with this his divine ratiocination, *See that you do not abuse or contemn any of these my little ones. For I say unto you, that their Angels do alwayes behold the face of my Father who is in heaven*, he seems apparently to speak something, that serves directly for the catholik beleef, and is consequently against these three assertions of *Whitby* to the contrary. For those angel-guardians, whom our Lord calls *their angels*, the angels of his beleevers, and of his little ones, either they must be so perspicatious, as one way or other to see even in heaven, where they behold the face of God in glory, all the perfe-

cutions and neceſſities of them whoſe angels they are: or at leaſt, whilſt they are preſent on earth, with them whoſe angels they be, they muſt ſtill ſee and enjoy the God of glory who is in heaven: Both theſe things are poſſible; and, whether it be this or that, they muſt needs be both ſo potent and good, as to be able and willing, when they ſee time, to aſſiſt and help them in their afflictions and need, whoſe angels they are, either by praying for them in general, or in particular, or by ſtrengthening, comforting, protecting their perſons. And laſtly, poor man may comfort himſelf in this inviſible aſſiſtance, whatever it be, and however it be wrought, without making thoſe angels his gods, or relying upon them as his final end.

And all this muſt be intended by our Lord and Saviour in that his comfortable ratiocination, I ſhould think, if it conclude any thing. If they be not there inſinuated, it is very hard to ſay what it may conclude. If the angels do neither pray for us, nor any way aſſiſt and help us, nor we can without danger of ſin rely on any ſuch aſſiſtance, then ſurely to ſay, *Let none abuſe my little ones, for their angels, &c.* would be a ratiocination as impertinent, as to ſay, *Let none abuſe, &c. for the North and South poles are half the heavens diſtant*: and far more dangerous. For man could hardly be perſwaded by ſuch a ſpeech, to put any truſt in that diſtance of the poles,

poles, as here he cannot but be moved to take comfort in that acquaintance and nearnes we have with angels, which any way to rely on, Mr. Whitby tell us, is to rest in them as our final end, and make them our gods.

I could wish Mr. Whitby would first consult his own reason, whether any way to rely on the comfort of second causes visible or invisible, infer necessarily, that we do rely upon them as our ultimate end, and make them our gods, as he affirms more then once in this his 16 chapter: And again, I desire him, that he would be more wary, and take heed how he speaks against the angels of God, and deride those hosts of heaven, in whom our Lord Christ advised us, if I understand him right, to take comfort; lest they strike him, as som others they have don, with sudden death. Poor Catholiks are yet in their pilgrimage and place of sufferance, who must therfor patiently endure all scoffs, contumelies and slanders, for their futur merit. But the Angels of God are in glory, and blessed, and therfor not to be blasphemed or mockt at by insolent dust, or their protection and assistance to be slighted.

What is the essence of Angels, what their presence, or how great their power, we cannot here under our thick corporeal veil conceiv. They may, for ought we can tell, be as compleatly present all at once, both here on earth,

and heaven too, unto any effect of perceiving or operating, as a man is present within the four walls of his chamber. At least if our Lord whom we pretend all of us equally to believ, hath so clearly allowed us, to support our selves in their assistance, however it be wrought, no man I should think, who bears the name of Christian, can with any modesty affirm, as *Whitby* does here, that they neither pray for us in heaven, nor assist us on earth; nor that we can any way support our selvs in any comfort from them, without making them our gods.

Ch. 17. from page 369. to 410.

Is very bitter against the celibacy and single life of priests, and exclaims on the contrary, with very broad language, that you may see he is very sensible of what he sayes, against the uncleanes of the clergy, not excepting any, nor allowing so much as a possibility to do otherwise. *And I doubt not*, saith he, p. 378. *whether such advocates of Celibacy, as M. C. if strict inquiry were made, might not be often found where the Card. of Crema was.* Where that man was found, I do not know. In all likelihood it was in som place where Jobs asses use to graze, for he lately made you, Sir, one of them.

Good Sir, do not hate the man, as he deservs, but pitty, pardon, and pray for him. He has mocked away his own angel-guardian, and cannot therfor be civil towards men. Mr. Whitby under-

understands not the several wayes and means prescribed by catholik religion, as a preservative against the incursions of that, or any other sensual temptation. He is unacquainted either with their frequent fastings, or disciplines, or hair-cloth, or continual and hourly exercise of psalms, hymns, and canticles, which take up in a manner all the whole life of the Roman Clergy. That man who uses heartily such like exercises, commended by catholik religion, will easily subdue any whatever temptation, if ever it should assault him, as they know well enough who practis that their religion seriously, and prevent oftentimes its very assault. But if any will be so forgetful of his own welfare, as utterly to neglect those sacred means, he may fall deservedly into a lower religion, and becom a *Whitby*. Ministers are either in bed with their wives, or thinking haply after one, when the catholik clergy, if they correspond with their duty and calling, are watching and saying their sacred mattins, which consist of many divine lessons, psalms, anthems, responsories, hymns, canticles, which put divine and spiritual thoughts into their minds. When ministers are feasting, they fast: When they are caressing their mistrisses, these chastise their body with disciplines: When they, got out of their beds, are at their mornings draught, these are saying their Lauds and Prime, and devoutly disposing themselves by

prayer and meditation upon their knees, unto their sacred liturgy: When they are eating and drinking, and mannaging worldly affairs about their wives and children, these are at their Sext and None, and Vespars, and Compline, that they may fulfill their daily task of prayers and devotions to their Redeemer. I say no more, but of this I am and will be confident, that if Mr. Whitby had ever practised, or seen the lives and conversations of Roman Priests, those visible angels of God, or been otherwise acquainted therewith, he would not have so boldly affirmed as he does, even against the very tenour of gospel, (which saith, that som are made eunuchs by men, and som again make themselvs so for the kingdom of heaven) that it is impossible to be chast. Nor would he so universally calumniat all professours of chastity for the wickednes of som few, who have in som particular ages and places given offence by their evil lives unto Catholiks, whose testimony Mr. *Whitby* uses against them. But commonly men judg of others as they act themselvs. And he that keeps himself chast, will in charity think so of other men.

When you say Sir, and all catholiks with you, that it is indeed a doctrin of devils both pernicious and fals, to forbid marriage absolutely as evil and unlawful in it self, as did the Encratites, Montanists, Marcionites, and Manichees; but yet

yet relatively and upon som particular account may som persons notwithstanding be withheld from marriage for diviner purposes, as catholik Church uses. For so the women, which were particularly addicted to the service of the altar, St. *Paul* would have them to be elderly and mature, left being young, they should grow wanton from Christ, and desire to marry. This distinction will in no wise serv Mr. *Whitby*.

For saith he *with his reverend Hall, the doctrin thus stigmatised by the apostle as the doctrin of Devils is in general of such as do forbid marriage, and not upon this or that particular account. And the act is all one whether the prohibition be relative or absolute, as poison is poison whether absolutely or conditionally taken.* Thus speaks Whitby with his reverend Hall, thence inferring, if I understand him, that it is as full and truly the doctrin of devils to forbid marriage to any one upon any account, of serving God more purely and the like, as it is to forbid it absolutely as evil and unlawful in it self; as poison, &c.

But is this true? Poison conditionally taken, or taken upon condition, either of a preservative against it, or of som diseas, wherof it is a proper remedy, may not poison or hurt the man that takes it, but rather help perhaps and cure him. And if it do not poison but help, then is it no poison to him, but physick.

And do they forbid marriage as in it self

unlawful, who do relatively prohibit it? Or is it equally the doctrin of devils to withhold it, as unlawful to all, or only to som upon a special occasion? Do they condemn it in it self who withhold it in relation to som times or persons? That I may omit other several reasons, which may convince this assertion of folly and falsehood, how coms our Church of England to forbid marriage in Advent and Lent, and som other times of the year? Is not this a relative prohibition? And doth our Church of England therfor absolutely forbid it in it self, becaus she relatively forbids it? I am sure the prohibition is as much relative, to forbid marriage to all persons at som times, as to forbid it to som persons at all times. And if the doctrin be stigmatized in general, upon what account soever it run, then doth the Church of England hold and teach the doctrin of devils, when upon this or that particular account, she prohibits marriage, although she absolutely allows it, as the Roman Church does.

The rubrick of our English Church now put into our Almanack runs thus.

Times prohibiting Marriage.

Marriage comes in the 23 of January, and by the 7 of February it goes out again until Low-Sunday, at which time it coms in again, and goes not out till Rogation Sunday from that time it is unforbidden until Advent Sunday. But then it goes out,

and

and coms not in again till the 27. of January following: All which in the phraſe of Dr. *Pierce* and *Whitby* his champion runs thus.

Times commanding the doctrin of devils.

The doctrin of devils goes out the 23 of January, and by the 7 of February it comes in again; until Low Sunday, at which time it goes out again; and coms not in till Rogation Sunday; from that time it goes out until Advent Sunday. But then the doctrin of devils coms in; and it goes not out again till the 23 of January.

The ſame is alſo to be ſaid about abſtaining from fleſh in Lent. For this prohibition is equally ſtigmatized by the ſame Apoſtle in the very ſelf-ſame text, as the devils doctrin. And a diſpenſation to eat fleſh in Lent, cannot be obtained in our Byſhops Courts, without a ſum of moneys; and generally to abſtain from the doctrin of devils we give an angel, either a gold angel or a ſilver one.

Truth is; it is no devils doctrin or evil counſel to refrain either from fleſh or marriage, or any way to bridle, and mortifie our carnal appetites, which our holy apoſtles have counſelled us carefully to do, but a bleſſed angelical converſation. For *the angels of God*, ſaith Chriſt our Lord, *do neither marry nor are given in marriage.* And the fleſh of bulls and goats neither doth God nor his angels feed on. And both the counſel and practis of Chriſt and his apoſtles

lead

lead us that way. When the *Bridegroom is taken away, then*, saith Christ, *shall my disciples fast*; that is, they shall then enter upon their austerities of life after their solemn profession in Pentecost, which now in their noviceship I will not put upon them, while they are yet weak in faith. Unto those very same disciples he also perswaded continence and cœlibacy, both by his own example and words of counsel. And devils are all friends to the contrary uncleannes and gluttony.

But why then are these two abstinencies so opposite both of them to the devils will and inclination, called by St. Paul *Doctrina damoniorum*, whereas devils were never known to move any man to those abstinencies, but rather to the contrary excesses, being enemies themselvs to all cleanlines & temperance? Doth the devil approve of that which our Lord advises us to follow? Or does he labour to promote Christs counsel and practis? No, in no wise. But whatsoever he may pretend of good, he ever does it to som evil end, and for snares and subversion. He likes not of continence, he loves not temperance, he hates cleanlines. But so to praise that which himself indeed dislikes, and perswade men to beleev, that such an act of high vertue and counsel is also of such necessity, that no man can be a Christian without it. This is one of his demoniacal subtilties.

The

The Greek hath two ſeveral words to expres thoſe evil ſprits in general, *Dæmonium*, and *Diabolus*, the one ſpeaks his crafty ſubtilties, the other his malicious will. But we in Engliſh have but one, and it renders properly the laſt. For the old Saxes our forefathers called that evil ſpirit *Deuvill* or *Doill*, which relates to the will or practice. But *Dæmonium* or *Dæmon*, for which we have no Engliſh word, has a reference to the underſtanding, and to the perverting of it. And it ſignifies *intelligent* or *knowing*.

Now this doctrin of abſtinence from meats and marriage as things unlawful, is called by St. Paul *doctrina dæmoniorum*, the doctrin of *dæmons*, or of thoſe evil ſpirits, not as they are wicked practiſers, but cunning ſeducers, not as they corrupt the will, but delude the underſtanding. They hate continence, and never have or will move any man towards it. But if under colour of its excellency, they could once perſwade men to beleev, that ſalvation is not poſſible for married people, as in primitive times of Chriſtianity they did, then have they acted the part of demons or cunning ſeducers indeed, and brought much ruin and diſorder and ſnares upon the Chriſtian world, which, it is indifferent to them, what way it ſuffer, ſo it receiv a dammage.

This craft of *demons* conſiſts generally in this, that to make themſelvs and temptations plauſible,

ble, they ſtill advance one ability or vertue, to depreſs another. In primitive times of the Church they exalted that of the right hand, to depreſs the left; in theſe later times they exalt the vertue of the left hand, to depreſs the right. Thus marriage is good, and continence alſo is good; they are both good: Nay S. Paul ſayes, that continence is better, or the vertue of the right hand: For *he that is unmarried only cares*, ſayes he, *how to ſerve God well, and pleas him; but he that is married is ſolicitous for many worldly affairs* concerning his wife and children, and ſo is *diſtracted* and *divided* two wayes. To exalt then the one of theſe two, which are both good things, unto ſuch a monopoly of goodnes and excellency, that the other ſhall be thought unlawful and evil; this is *doctrina demoniorum*, the doctrin of demons, who were cunning ſeducers from the beginning.

Thus faith is good, and other works of pietty, juſtice, and ſobriety, unto which Chriſt and his apoſtles exhort us, are good alſo, and neceſſary and healthful. He therfor that ſo magnifies the one, as to evacuate the other, teaches *doctrinam demoniorum*, the doctrin of demons, who were cunning ſeducers from the beginning.

Meat is good, and faſting is good; good to eat with thanksgiving; and good in times and occaſions to abſtain. But that man, who ſo ex-

exalts the one, as to exclude the other out of Christianity, is a seducer, and teaches the doctrin of *demons*. So likewise doth he, who either so highly magnifies free will, as to exclude Gods grace; or so defends grace, that he abolishes all concurrence of free will unto works of piety and merit, teach both of them equally the doctrin of *demons*, who were cunning seducers from the beginning.

In a word, not to mention more examples, wherin I might be copious, so to commend continence, as to make marriage unlawful, is the doctrin of demons, who were cunning seducers from the beginning. And so again, to set up marriage, as to teach continence to be both sinful and impossible, is the doctrin both of demons and devils too, implacable enemies both to truth and continence. And Christ is equally crucified between both the theeves.

Ch. 18. *from page* 410. *to* 420.

Begins to justifie the departure or schisme of the English from the Roman Church, as good and lawful. For *if Schisme*, saith he, *be a crime, it lies upon the Church, not which separated, but which gave the cans of separation, the Roman, not the English Church: Causal schisme, which gives the occasion, bears all the blame; but formal schisme, which separates from an offensive society, is an action of necessary vertue. Nor can there be*, quoth he, *any necessity of communicating with*

with others in wicked actions; but a necessity rather of going out of Babylon. Nor does every schisme turn the Church of Christ into a synagogue of Satan, but only schisme in fundamentals, which fundamentals, he saith elswhere, *are as clear and perspicuous to all men, as that twice two make four.* These Sir be his capital assertions in this chapter, which howlittle they will serve his purpos against the Roman Church, he that seriously reads your book against which this reply is made, will soon perceiv: But how much they will disadvantage him before the Presbyterian, Quaker, and other wayes here in England, who separating from our English Church, do thus justifie their schisme, either by mincing the fault, or laying it upon her from whom they have revolted, it behoovs him well to consider.

Ch. 19. from page 420 to 428.

Endeavours yet more to diminish the fault, and justifie the secession. *Schisme,* saith he, *that proceeds from weakness, in persons that desire to know the truth, and endeavour after it, is free from crime.* And again, *External unity is not essential to the Church. And schisme that is contrary to that unity, divides not from Christs body in things absolutely necessary to be united, but only in things not so necessary, as in the same liturgies or ceremonies about matters not fundamental, wherein an union is neither necessary nor yet possible.* This is, I am sure, the voice of a Presbyterian, and no

Pre-

Prelatick Protestant, as Whitby speaks himself to be. And if it be indeed the sence of our English Church, as her spokes-man here would make us beleev it is, then are surely our English Byshops in charity all obliged, earnestly to intercede with his royal Majesty, who for civil respects hath forbidden all meetings out of ordinary Churches and Chappels, that the poor Quaker, who endeavours after truth and light with an innocent and unfeigned heart, may be permitted for religious respects to meet at *Bull* and *Mouth*, and other such like places, where they may think fit, being now resolved never to resort more to Protestant Steeple-houses, or to any of their liturgies or ceremonies; which communion is neither *necessary* unto any unity, any substantial unity in Christs body, nor yet *possible*; that they may declare amongst themselvs the sons of light, the power and truth in simplicity of heart, without impeachment of the wicked.

Ch. 20. *from page* 428. *to* 448.

Falls again to speak against *Infallibility*, which he had battered before in his whole 9 chapter of above 30 pages, and that with as much earnestnes here, as if nothing had been yet said of it. But this chapter was written haply by som other hand, which knew not what the former had performed; till coming together both of the papers to the Press, it was perceived they might both pass.

And

And here all general Councels, and their determinations are disabled, as destitute of any assurance of truth. *Is this Infallibility*, quoth he out of Chillingworth, *in the Councel alone, or Pope alone, &c. What shall we do, if they run counter, &c. To whom must we hearken when many pretend to the Popedom, &c. What if the Popes misdemeanour be the thing to be judged, &c. How can we be assured that any one is true Pope, not Symoniacally ordained, not illegally elected, not invalidly baptised, &c. which are,* saith he, *uncertainties propounded by Mr. Chillingworth, not possible to be resolved.* This kind of discours fills up this whole chapter.

By vertue of these uncertainties, we can never tell, whether Mr. *Whitby* be any minister or no; or whether he be a Christian, or so much as a *Whitby*. If *titulus coloratus* and moral evidence may not suffice us, we can be sure of no authority either spritual or civil in this world. And if any one should learn by this wise master, thus to except against the obliging power of acts and decrees of King or Parliament. *Is that power in the King alone, or in the Parliament alone, &c. What if they run counter, &c. What if they should not be rightly chosen, &c.* would he not talk as wise as this man and his little Doctor Chillingworth? It ought to suffice an honest man and a good subject, that an authority is set over him and peaceably accepted, whom he ought

ought indefinitly to obey, not only for wrath but conſcience. It is not his part to weaken due loyalty with theſe ſeditious querks and quibbles, *Who can tell whether he be legitimatly begotten, or rightly baptiſed, or legally elected, &c.* Catholiks have as much ground for their obedience to civil and ſpiritual Superiours, as they have for their obſervance of their own natural father. And I think that is enough. If we had it not promiſed in Goſpel as we have, that Chriſt would preſerv his Church from failing and errour; yet the very beleef we have in his divinity, would naturally infer ſuch a confidence, as Catholicks have in the Churches truth.

But Mr. *Whitby* underſtands not in whom this infallibility does originally reſide, as I perceiv by his fond interrogatories, nor conſequently what it is If he had ever had the happy hour to read the Syſtem of that learned Doctour *Franciſcus Davenport*, by whoſe light I have lately, Sir, ſince your departure hence to Paris, ſufficiently declared in our Engliſh tongue, all this whole buſines of infallibility, he had ſaved a multitude of idle words drawn out of his famous fanatick Mr. Chillingworth. Catholik Divines may ſeveral wayes defend and declare this buſines of Infallibility, as well as other points of religion, according to their ſeveral conceptions and abilities, and may go ſom of them

ſo far, as to defend even an intrinſecal inherent Infallibility either in the Pope or Councel. And although this may ſuffer more difficulty then the extrinſecall one of Gods providence and guidance, yet do I not ſee how any one can diſprove a poſſibility of it. However faith does not require ſo much at their hands. If God be but infallible, and Chriſt be true, the Church is ſafe.

Very many bitter books have been written againſt Catholiks and their religion, injuriouſly diminiſhing both them and it, upon the miſtake of this one buſines of Infallibility, perhaps a wilful one; two very lately by Mr. *Moulin* and *Denton*, to the great hurt and dammage of the innocent, if men beleev them. It is a very pious and good rule, that of the Canon and civil law, *Cum ſunt jura partium obſcura, reo favendum eſt potius quam actori.* But I doubt much whether the people of England, who may read theſe invective books againſt Papiſts, follow that rule or no. *When the right of Parties is obſcure*, ſaith the law, *the defendant is rather to be favoured than the plaintiff.* If it were ſo here, we ſhould not have been by ſuch bitter books, ſo highly incenſed, as I ſee we are, againſt poor Catholiks; but againſt thoſe rather who ſlander them.

Mr. Moulin would prove, that Catholik religion and not Proteſtancy, is guilty of ſeditiſon;

on; and he does it by *a relation of passionate words and actions of some Popes recorded in stories.* And this he takes to be a sufficient proof that Catholik religion is guilty of sedition. It were indeed to be wished, that all Popes words and actions were answerable to their religion and rule. But that is hardly to be expected in this world. The very place, and honour that has ever been given to that seat, is no small temptation of pride, or other passions incident thereupon into a mind not more then ordinarily furnished with all Christian vertues. But if we will beleev histories concerning them, we shall find no series or succession of men in any one place or dignity of this world, to have held forth so many lights of vertue, as that one chair hath don. And if som have been faulty, they gave no doubt much caus of grief or scandal, but none of wonderment to the world. They may surely fail in a greater temptation; since other Christians who have the same means of grace, do fail in lesser. But *Catholiks*, saith Mr. Moulin, *are bound by the very tenour of their religion to hold for good and justifie, all that any of their Popes have ever said or don.* This would be very strange, why so? Becaus, saith he, they beleev them infallible. Who beleevs them infallible? How infallible? that they can neither do nor speak amiss? Who ever thought that? *Infallible* is a word taken up lately by schoolmen, to

expres the sovereign power and indeficiency of Gods Church, and not any inherent endowments of a Pope, who is brought up when he is young, like one of us, in the Catechise and practice of Christian religion, and when he is ripe and placed by Gods providence in that supream chair is eminently to practise those holy rules, and carefully to keep and maintain that *depositum fidei*, the treasury of faith which he hath received; and if he fail therin, shall give an account and suffer for it in another world, as severely as any other for their faults: Nor are his words and actions a rule to other men of Christian religion, but Christian religion is a rule to him both for his actions and words. And all that Infallibility which Catholik writers, to expres more than one thing in one short word, make use of in their discourses with Protestants, is only an extrinsecal providence of God watching over his Church, to preserv the primitive apostolik spirit in her, and to keep her alwayes even to the consummation of the world from errour and deficiency, notwithstanding any opposition from without, or the misdemeanours of any one or other within her self; even the providence of that good God, whose property it is not only to prevent evil from the good, but even to work good out of evil; that his Church which he hath promised to preserv may be ever safe. And if ever this infallible providence do show it

ſelf, it muſt ſurely be then, when the ſhip is ready to be ſplit by hereſies and ſchiſmes, that riſe from ſom violent ſpirits breaking unity with that body ſo dangerouſly, that Prelates are called together from all parts of the world as a help extraordinary, in a general Councel to prevent the ruin. And this is that which Divines mean, when they ſay, that the Pope is infallible *in Cathedra*, in the Chair, that is to ſay, *in conſeſſu Seniorum & Presbyterorum eccleſiæ*, in a general convention of Chriſtian Prelates. So that Moulin ſpeaks not one word to the purpos.

But Doctour Dentons book is not any ſuch miſtake, but pure malice. He intends to ſhow, *that Papiſts were never puniſhed for religion, but for treaſon.* And his book is altogether made up of ſeveral ſtories of men, Papiſts men, ſent over hither from beyond ſeas, as he ſayes, to kill, poiſon, and deſtroy people. Some, when they had read his book, took the Authour for a fool; but I heard afterwards, that he is Phyſician. And upon that account I had him excuſed. For if he be as bad at phyſick, as he is in affairs of religion, he had caus to be angry with them, who came hither from forreign parts, to take his office and emploiment out of his hands, kill and poiſon people. If the villains, who ever they were, had been only ſent over to make folks ſick, they had don him ſom ſervice; but to

poiſon men, and kill them down-right, that may give the Phyſician a juſt caus of wrath againſt thoſe intruding empyricks. He begins his book thus, *I ſuppoſe it is a matter of faith with all Papiſts, that the Pope is infallible, and that he can depoſe Kings, &c.* Thus doth that wiſe man open his mouth and begin his *Recipe*. Two things very ſeldom ſeen in any Academick concluſions, when ſtudents defend a whole body of divinity in the ſchools, but never delivered in Goſpel or declared in Councels, or heard or thought of by any one Catholik in the world, as any thing of his religion, theſe Mr. Denton ſuppoſes to be matter of faith with all Papiſts. I would ask Mr. Denton, whether he thinks it a matter of faith among Papiſts, *That the earth moves*, or no. If one Catholik hold thoſe two aſſertions, which in his ſence I cannot tell whether any one do or no; I will be bold to ſay, a thouſand hold this. The next book Dr. Denton writes againſt Papiſts, will haply begin thus: *I ſuppoſe it is a matter of faith with all Papiſts, that the earth moves.* And then he may go on with his moon-ſtories, and build caſtles in the air, and Dentoniſe, as here he hath done.

Ch. 21. from p. 448. to 456.

Allows that general Councels, although they be not infallible, are highly *notwithſtanding, both themſelvs and their decrees to be eſteemed*; pro-

provided that they keep to Gods rule; that clear reason be not against them; that men of worth do not gainsay them; and that their proceedings be legal. Not otherwis. Thus he recalls himself and mends the matter. All these four things, if general Councels observ, they shall be observed themselves, notwithstanding they may haply be a company of bastards and buffoons, neither legitimately begotten, nor rightly baptised, nor validly elected, nor legally ordained. And whether these specified conditions be, or be not in councels and their decrees, every man, as Whitby here and several other places of his book speaks, is to judg according to his own pleasur and discretion. So that according to his rule, the discretion and will of particular men is the final resolv of all religion, faith, and practis. Whence it will follow, that if there be as many religions as men, they must be all good.

When you object Sir, that such a liberty as this will be destructive even of all articles, canons, and acts of Parliament, in order to our establisht Protestancy or other affairs. To this Whitby replyes according to his custom, very hotly. *Doth it becom a confuter of Mr. Chillingworth,* saith he, *thus to trifle? Hath he not told you that others may make the same defence as we? as murderers may cry not guilty, as well as innocent persons; but not so justly, not so truly.* For Gods sake who trifles here? when both *Chillingworth*

and *Whitby* too, had put into every private mans hand an equal power of judging, admitting or rejecting the decrees, orders, and laws of their superiours, he now distinguishes with *Chillingworth* his fanatick Master, that som do it justly and truly; others not so justly, not so truly. But who shall pass judgment upon the final and only irrefragable judg, or aver such a thing of any one, who hath an equal and unlimited power beforehand, to take and reject what himself pleases. Both truth and justice must solely be in his will, who may admit and refuse as himself willeth.

But the party now esteemed faulty will be meal-mouthed we must think, and not dare to say, he both truly and justly does what he does; or to affirm, that he uses his own discretion, in that which he takes or refuses by his own liking. The Protestant forsooth, separated from the Roman, both truly and justly: but the Presbyterian, Independent and Quaker, these refuse the Protestants communion, not so truly, not so justly, although they do it upon the same right and title, and by the same principles the other used himself, and allows to other men. The Protestant shall reject the Parliament of Prelates, who establisht Catholik religion, and do it justly and truly, only for this reason, that they do it upon their own discretion; but another if he shall except against a Council of Lords

and

and Commons, that shall set up Prelate Protestancy, although according to *Whitby* they be no judges of our faith, he does it not so justly, not so truly, though he do it by his own discretion allow'd him to be his final resolv. What is this but to do wickedly, and talk fondly? First to subjugate all degrees of autority to every mans judgment, as the final and last rule; and then to question that rule, which he made subject unto nothing.

But that we may understand what a worthy respect Mr. Whitby has for general Councels, he tells us here, *that it is neither impossible nar improbable that general Councels may erre. Nay our writers*, quoth he, *do not acknowledg general Councels to be infallible even in fundamentals.* And Whitby writes, we all know by this time, what his writers writ before him.

I cannot but marvel at this his talk. For Whitby in several places of his book affirms himself, that fundamentals are so perspicuous and clear, that no man can be so ignorant, if he be not a natural fool, as to mistake therin. *We*, saith he p. 104. *distinguish between points fundamental and not fundamental. These are clearly revealed, and so of necessary beleef. And to determine their sence, there is no more need of a judg, then for any other perspicuous truth. What need of a judge to decide whether scriptur affirms that there is but one God, that this God cannot lye, that*

Jesus

Jesus Christ was sent by his commission into the world, that he was crucified and rose again, that without faith and obedience we cannot com to heaven. These and such like are the truths which we entitle fundamental. And if the sence of this needs an infallible judg, then let us bring Euclids elements to the bar, and call for a judg to decide whether twice two make four. So he likewise avers, p. 441. *that fundamentals are as perspicuous, as if they were written by a sun-beam.* He reckons not the Trinity amongst his fundamentals; perhaps he does not take it for one; or will have no fundamentals, but what are perspicuous.

I could make it easily appear, that even fundamentals have been denied, and that with as great reason, as any he calls otherwis, are denied now. But I must be brief. That which I here note is this; What is as perspicuous as a sun-beam, as certain as Euclids elements, as evident as that which is most clearly revealed, as notorious a known truth, as that twice two make four, so clear that there needs no judg to determin it; This the Prelates of the Christian world met together, which none but a natural fool can mistake, must not be able to discern. They and none but they, can erre in fundamentals.

And yet, which does not a little encreas our admiration, he acknowledges withall p. 439.

That

That general Councels have 1 a greater assistance of the Spirit of God, 2 greater means of finding out the truth, 3 better reason of discovering what is the opinion of the whole Church, 4 an authority delegated from Christ to decide controversies. After all this, and with all this, it is neither impossible with him, nor unprobable, that general councels may erre, even in fundamentals, which himself affirms as perspicuous, as if they were writ with a sun-beam, as clear and evident as that twice two make four. Prelates, Christian Prelates, these must be the only natural fools of the world.

Ch. 22. from page 456. to 461.

Descends to Patriarchal Councels, which saith he, *may be disobeyed and rejected, because such conventions are fallible, and may obtrude heresies and unlawful practises upon the world; and that a judgment of discretion is to be allowed unto private men, whether they are to submit to their determinations or no.*

This whole chapter might well have been spared. For if a greater, much more may a particular and lesser Church obtrude heresies and unlawful practises upon men. But Mr. Whitby is desirous, that all should be made plain, and not any rub lie in the Presbyterian and good Quakers way, when he shall plead an excuse for his separation from a Metropolitan Church here in England, which he hath made with a judg-

judgment of discretion here allowed him.

Ch. 23. from page 465 to 478.

Sayes that the Protestant never separated from the internal communion of the universal Church, which unity is only essential, but only from external union with som. And such an union external with any Church on earth, is no wayes necessary to any ones being a member of the Church.

Why then is the poor Quaker so grievously persecuted, imprisoned, and beaten, only for separating from an external communion with other Protestants? Especially since he separates from it, for no other end, but to have the internal communion in pure faith, and light, and grace, and charity, more perfect. Let any man read the Quakers books, which are now not a few, and see if they speak not for themselvs, as *Whitby* here does for his own caus.

But *the profest errours of the Roman Church justifie the Protestant separation.* And does not the Quaker justifie his separation both from Roman and Protestant too by the same argument of notorious abuses, errours, sins, falsities, disorders, superstitions, excesses, of ministers, priests, byshops, deanaries, chapters, lawn sleeves, universities and steeple-houses.

Ch. 24. from page 478 to 494.

Endeavours finally to justifie the English reformation upon the account, *that it was made here by the supream magistrate, who may reform the*

the Church either with a Synod or without it.

And that ſupream power I hope then may be permitted to ſet up the Presbyterian or Quaker, at leaſt to give them freedom of Conſcience, if himſelf pleas, without any biſhops conſent, no man daring to gain-ſay or murmur againſt it, which not a few do heartily wiſh to ſee in this Land.

Ch. 25. with the Appendix, from p. 494 to 512.

Preſcribes conditions and forms of diſputing and replying, with ſom additions to his former diſcourſes.

Thus have you, Sir, the particular deſign of each ſeveral chapter of Mr. *Whitby's* book, the negative part wherof denies your Church, and the poſitive betrayes his own. Why he gainſayes yours, it is not hard to read. But why he ſhould ſo much endanger his own, I cannot ſo eaſily ſay, whether it be ignorance, malice, or neceſſity moves him to it. Surely no Son of the Engliſh Church, as Whitby profeſſes himſelf to be, could thus open a gap for the incurſion of all ſects, who are now ready to ſwallow her up, if he be in ſound ſences, but he muſt either not have what he may, or not will what he ſhould, or not know what poſitively he ought, to affirm and teach for her better preſervation. This book of Whitbies can never bring any man to that Church; nor keep any in that is there. If an enemy attempt the ſubverſion of a hous, it may chance to ſcape. But

if

if the owner and inhabitant begin once to pull it down himself, he that passes by may not improbably conjectur it will not long stand. Well may the Church of England take up that heavy complaint against this her either ignorant or malicious son. *If an enemy had don me mischief, I could have endured it. And if one who openly hated had maligned me, I could have kept my self from him. But thou man! thou my intimate friend! thou my leader and acquaintance!* Thus unworthily to be betrayed by her own *White boy*, must be no small aggravation to the mothers sorrow.

I might easily gather out of *Whitbies* own words, consequently put together, a compleat play for all the several wayes that are now of late risen up against our English Church; even so compleat, that they never have nor ever need to say more. This sad fate accompanies erroneous wayes, that even in defending they destroy themselvs.

If witty Presbyterians assisted him in his book, they did their own work not his. And if he did it himself by som Presbyterian principles, received accidentally from them, he hath don therby not his own work, but theirs.

Notable is this Gentlemans art in citing of authorities, which he does in most of his chapters, against the points of catholik beleef, which are either not expressed in his book, where

where they may be found; or not there found, where they are expreſt; or expreſs no ſuch thing, as he cites them in his book to utter. I had in my chamber but one of thoſe many authors which Whitby cites for himſelf: and I found in it all this to be true. But this Sir, to ſpare here partly the mans modeſty, and partly my own pains and expence of time, I now omit. And indeed, what would it avail, to give you or the world to underſtand, that Whitby never read the authors himſelf cites, or underſtood not, or wilfully wreſted them. Let him live and learn. And God give him grace to make uſe of his time, to his own advantage.

This thing I may aſſure you of, that Whitby is an enemy not only to Catholiks, but Proteſtants alſo of all profeſſion, here in England: or if you had rather have me ſo ſpeak, an equal friend to all. For he will not have the Church of Chriſt to be any *organical body*, as he calls it, or company of people linked together in Sacraments, lyturgy, beleef, and government; but to be only ſuch and all ſuch people, who hold God and a life to com, and ſom other fundamentals, which he names not himſelf, all of them: and therfor, as I ſuppoſe, leavs unto others, each man as he pleaſes, to determin. Nor will he have men bound either to an internal beleef, or any exteriour conformity to any Church. This himſelf avers in many ſeveral

places

places of his book, that we may not miss his meaning. This new way of his I think he borrowed of som French Hugonots. For all the wayes that be here now in England concur each one unto a body, an organical body; not only Roman Catholiks, but our Englisch Prelacy and Presbyterians too. Yea, the very Quakers to my knowledg esteem none to be so much as Christians, who assemble not with them. And they have with them som ministers of the gospel too, though extemporary ones.

A wary reader may observ, by the sole mirrour of this book of Whitbies, which is a collection of most of the chief authors that have written against Popery, since the Reformation, how unsettled all Protestants be in all the controverted points of religion, wherof ther is not any one by som of them denied, but is by som others of them affirmed. They know what Church to oppose; but how much of her doctrin they should evacuate, they could never yet unanimously agree, nor what answer to fix steadily to any Catholik ground.

He will find also amongst other things, that our present Protestants now adayes, do generally swerv from the first reformers, almost in all points both of disciplin and faith; about supremacy, good works, free will, possibility of keeping Gods commands, the real presence, prayer for the dead, tradition, &c. which former

Pro-

Protestants for the first forty years would not abide to hear of; but now they are all in a manner so allowed by most Protestants, that there appears little difference between their way and catholik faith; but only, that this stands unchanged, the other may alter again to morrow. Indeed every Protestant writer is in one thing or other a new reformer, as Whitby is here. And every half-score years brings forth new scenes, nor is there any now that heeds any Protestant writer that is gon, if he speak contrary to him, though he were never so eminent, even in the very point and busines of Reformation. This is enough for Whitby.

I heard Sir above half a year ago, that Dr. Barlow had made ready for the Press another book of his own against Mr. Cressy: and therfor deteined this my letter with me, till I might give you an account of his with it. Truly Sir, I watched as earnestly for it, as any cat watches for a mous. But it will not yet appear. In the interim, one Mr. Stillingfleet has lately written a great book against Popery, even so big a book in folio, that none may buy it, but only such as hate Popery more than they love fifteen shillings. And he also proceeds this new french Hugonot way, insisted on by Whitby. He is only for a Church diffusive, that holds fundamentals what ever they be, and makes no account of any Church organical. Wherby he

utterly disables not the Roman Hierarchy only, but even our English Protestant Church and government; if men do but understand what he sayes. And yet this man is mightily applauded by our English byshops: which I cannot but marvel at; and do thence conclude, that they all begin now to think, our English Church it self, that it may be made good, must be pulled down. Councels he holds with Whitby, that they can have no autority to move our assent, although they be general, as ther has never been any he sayes, these thousand years. And what is ther then for Gods sake shall move the Presbyterians, Independents, and others here in England to approve of the constitutions and government of our English Church, set up by a far lesser assembly.

In a word, this whole book of Stillingfleets is a large discours against a Theological argument of some Catholik disputant. The argument it seems was this; *Christian faith cannot be divine, except it have its birth from an infallible proposer; and consequently the Church must either be infallible, or els our faith is not divine.* The answer of this argument is the very life and vitals of Mr. Stillingfleets whole book. That same argument of the Catholik Gentleman is indeed a pretty theological ratiocination: and Stillingfleets answer, evasions, and distinctions, both concerning the argument in general, and all the par-

particulars it runs into are not unwitty. But this is no part of our busines. Alas we in our controversies about religion are not come thus far. Such a discours had been handsomly fitted to theologicall schools, and very proper amongst learned divines there: but here not so: What is it to our busines in hand, whether faith can or cannot be divine, except the proposer be infallible, and as it were divine. This is a meer theological dispute. And he that answers Stillingfleets book, defends not faith immediately, but an argumentators syllogisme. Religion indeed, as soon as ever it is questioned or disputed, runs presently into Philosophy. And therin, if great heed be not taken, it is quite lost. And thence it comes to pass, that most part of our controversie books is about school philosophy and human reasonings. I blame not the Catholik Gentleman, who ever he was, for his argumenting. Nor will Stillingfleet be blamed for defending his place. But I let my countreymen, spectators of the contest, understand, that in deed and truth, so often as we dispute, we are beyond the busines. All writers of controversie speak more then faith, when they either defend or oppose it. And in reading controversies we see not so much the nature of the faith, as the wit of him who opposes or defends it; and so much this some times, that the other is nothing at all discerned.

This the world must know and understand well; or els they will be miserably mistaken, as indeed I see all men are. When two lawyers plead about a case of right, perhaps three hours together; all that three hours talk is not law, or the right they talk of, but only their ratiocinations about it. And such are all our controversies about religion. And he does best therin, who still puts his adversary in mind what is his talk, and what is the faith they talk of. But he that defends both of them equally, forgets himself. And thus I see that generally men do miscarry on both sides: the Protestant by calling that Romanish doctrin, which is but a Catholiks discours for it; and the Catholik by maintaining that talk of his, which it is not a pin matter whether it stand or fall. For faith is firm and constant, though all my talk for it be miserably weak.

Now all the whole busines of faith, which Stillingfleet and his adversary talk of, is, as I take it, only this; *That the Church of Christ hath by Gods divine promis of being ever with her, a power to oblige her subjects to hear and obey her, if they mean to be happy in their way.* The Catholik affirms this: Stillingfleet with his Protestants deny it. And this is all the faith that is in it: which is not here touched. And a theological busines of Infallibility only spoke of. And therfor Stillingfleet is much to blame, when he

speaks

speaks so often in his book, of *the Romanists way of resolving faith*; *the Romanists arguments for their faith*; *the Romanists doctrin about infallibility not divine, but as it were divine*; *the Romanists sence about fundamentals*; *the Romanists motives of credibility*; *the Romanists doctrin about the material and formal object of faith, &c.* For all this and several such like talk is but the theological discours of that Catholik Gentleman, and of it self no Romanists doctrin at all. For I know well enough what Stillingfleet means, and would have meant by *Romanists doctrin*. And all his Protestant readers understand therby only Catholik religion: and he knows it well enough.

I should take it ill and be sorry, and look upon it as an injury to the Church of God, if any one should call my way of defending her faith, *the Romanists way*; or my talk, *the Romanists doctrin*: however the thing it self defended or excused by me is Roman or Catholik faith. The Church has no one way, but several methods, and several schools, and several wayes to declare and explicate, and defend her religion. And every writer does it according to his personall endowments and judgment; some better, some wors, though the religion so explicated, defended, and declared be still and ever, one and the very same. And if indeed I had been to speak in that busines, I should never have made

any such argument as that Catholike Gentleman did: nor will another man think himself obliged to discourse as I do, although he and I defend both of us the same thing. This if Mr. Stillingfleet consider as he ought, he will soon perceiv his own pittiful childishnes. But this Doctour OeN deals with me to my very great pitty and regret. Ever and anon, *Is this your Roman doctrin*, quoth he? *Who would have thought, that the Romish Church should dare to utter so wicked blasphemies*, &c. First misinterpreting my words, and calling that a doctrin which was none at all, but only a prosopopy of atheistical objections; and then stiling that a Roman doctrin, which was but the talk of a particular man. So that what he called Roman doctrin, and Romish doctrin, was neither Romish nor doctrin neither. But ministers care not what they say. And so much the more wary does it behove all men to be, who deal with them. Too much care cannot be taken with such men, who either cannot or will not distinguish between general faith and particular mens doctrin; between religion, and several school-methods of defending it; between the faith of the whole Church of God, and discourses of writers concerning it. So ignorant they are all of them, or wilfully malicious. I find in my heart even a longing desire to expres to you in particular the various shifts and misdemeanours of

Stil-

Stillingfleet. But here is now no time or place for it; and such a thing if it were done, would be but of little use to morrow. I mention him only, to let you know, how much the French Hugonot religion begins here to prevail by means of Whitby, Stillingfleet, and others, to the overthrow of our own Protestant Church here established; and to let posterity, who shall haply see any of these small writings, have some little glimmerings of these our present times. They doubtles will be glad to see the general cours of things now done, even as we are to read the wayes of former reformers; although neither we, nor they can take any great pleasur in any long particular narrations of their fallacies either against logick or morality, when the men are once past and gone.

Dr. Jeremy Taylor hath also put forth lately a very bitter, insulting, injurious book against Catholik religion, which he calls a *Dissuasive from Popery. Reddet illi dominus secundum opera ejus.* And God will bless his Catholik beleevers who trust in him, and walk according to their holy rule, in his fear and love, unblamable, the very contumelies of adversaries working at length to their greater good. And I beseech God, who revives all things, and Jesus our Lord, who gave his testimony under Pontius Pilate, a good confession, that they may ever observ the commandments of God, and the Church his Spous,

possessing their souls in perfect patience, unreprovable unto the coming of Jesus Christ our Lord, whom in his own times will the blessed God shew forth, the only potent one, the King of kings, and Lord of Lords, who alone hath immortality, and inhabits light inaccessible, whom no mortal man hath ever seen, nor yet can see him; to whom be all honour, dominion and power for evermore. Amen. This is the earnest desire and prayer of

Sir,

Given in the Nones of *March*. 1664.

Your real friend,
J. V. C.

EPI-

EPISTOLA AD AMPHIBOLUM. AGAINST Dr. Taylor.

The occasion of this Epistle.

THe first epistle was written to an adversary: the second to a friend: this third to a neuter; who after he had began to think more moderately of Catholik religion, returned, upon his reading of Dr. Jeremy Taylor his Dissuasive from Popery, *to his former misconceit. And he is by this Epistle given to understand, that the said* Dissuasive *is of that nature, that it can have no such force upon any judicious man.*

Sep-

D. *Iamdudum auſculto, & cupiens tibi dicere ſervus*
Pauca reformido. H. *Davuſne?* D. *Ita Davus, amicum*
Mancipium Domino, & frugi, quod ſit ſatis: hoc eſt
Ut vitale putes. H. *Age, libertate Decembri,*
Quando ita majores voluerunt, utere. Narra.
D. *Pars hominum vitiis gaudet conſtanter, & urget*
Propoſitum: pars multa natat, modo recta capeſſens,
Interdum pravis obnoxia.
H. *Non dices hodie, quorſum hæc tam putida tendunt*
Furcifer? D. *Ad te inquam.* H. *Quo pacto peſſime?* D. *Laudas*
Fortunam & mores antiquæ plebis: & idem,
Si quis ad illa Deus ſubitò te agat, uſq; recuſes:
Aut quia non ſentis, quod clamas, rectius eſſe:
Aut quia non ſirmus rectum defendis, & hæres,
Nequicquam cœno cupiens evellere plantam.
Non horam tecum eſſe potes: non otia recte
Ponere, teque ipſum vitas fugitivus, & erro.
H. *Unde mihi lapides?* D. *Quorſum eſt opus?*
H. *Unde ſagittas?*
Aut inſanit homo aut verſus facit. Ocyus hinc te
Ni rapis, accedes opera agro nona Dunano.

Epistola ad Amphibolum, against Doctour Taylor.

SIR,

YOu were pleased to say, upon your reading of *Fiat Lux*, that Popery may, for ought you knew, be more innocent then commonly it is reputed, and no wayes so odious as some would make it. But now, upon the reading of Dr. Taylor's Dissuasive, which you desire me to peruse, I perceiv you look towards your former thoughts concerning this maligned Popery, and invite them home again. To deal freely with you, I was amazed my self at the reading of that book, though not Sir with your amazement, but another of my own. You startled at Popery, whose uglines was there set before your eyes with such fresh colours. I at those ugly colours which so injuriously defaced that Religion, that most innocent Religion, which under the name of Popery lies here traduced by the pen of her own ungrateful Scribe.

Καὶ σὺ τέκνον! What, Doctour Taylor against Popery? And such a Dissuasive as this! But my amazement, Sir, is now blown over. The

Doctor

Doctour appeared to me after some serious thoughts, to be for a special reason, that touches none so much as himself, in some manner excusable. That none should love Popery, or ever come to know it, concerns not only his wealth and dignity, and life of ease, which is the common caus of others also with himself, but all the honour and fame he hath hitherto got by transcribing popish, as now he calls, but in former times named Catholik, authors. For, having bin twenty years and upwards deeply plunged in reading and transcribing som of the innumerous spiritual books, that are amongst Catholiks, not only in Latin, but other languages of several Kingdoms where that Religion flourishes, he hath culled out thence many fine treatises, which he hath set forth in his own name and language, to his much renown, and no small wealth and dignity amongst us. Nor is it to be doubted, but that he means for his yet further glory, reaped from other mens labours, and that spirit of piety which thence he got into his own pen, to write out yet one book more. The same store-house that furnished him with the life of Christ, will dictate to him also the lives of his twelve Apostles, and many other raptures of divine love, and heavenly devotion. And if people be but kept from Popery, as he hopes and labours they may, it will never be known, whence he gathers those his fragrant pieties. It

was

was not handsom, yet a piece of wisdom it was in the Grecian Cynick, to spit in the dish which pleased him best, lest others should taste how good it was, and deprive him therby of som of his content.

This book of Doctour Taylors called a *Dissuasive*, printed in Dublin, and as I understand, reprinted here in London, (I suppose in the very same words by reason of the Authors absence) is large enough, containing 179 pages in quarto, marvellously bitter, and contumeliously insulting over that Religion, which he cannot but know he misreports. Indeed, Sir, there is more popery in one page of Dr. Taylors *Life of Christ*, which he transcribed from popish Authors, than is in all this whole book which he writes against those Authors popery: that is owned by them to be their religion; all this he puts upon them under the notion of popery, throughout his whole hundred and seventy three pages, except haply som three or four words, whose sence also he perverts, no Catholik upon earth acknowledges for any parcel of his faith. Is not this strange disingenuous dealing? How he comes to act thus, and what is the feat he makes use of, to discolour their Religion, you shall hear by and by, when I have first opened his book, and the things contained in it.

His Dissuasive hath three chapters, and each chapter

chapter several sections. The first chapter is intitled thus; *The Doctrin of the Roman Church in the controverted articles is neither Catholik, Apostolik, nor Primitive.* The second thus; *The Church of Rome as it is at this day disordered, teaches doctrins, and uses practices, which are in themselves, or in their true and immediat consequences, direct impieties, and give warranty to a wicked life.* The third thus; *The Church of Rome teaches doctrins, which in many things are destructive of Christian society in general, and of Monarchy in special: both which the Religion of the Church of England and Ireland, does by her doctrins greatly and Christianly support.* These three be things of importance, and must either be great notorious crimes in the Defendant, or monstrous slanders in the Plaintiff. A Religion that is new, impious, and unsociable, that is against antiquity, piety, and society, is hardly good enough for Hell. Who is he that shall dare to profess or countenance such a religion upon earth. But let us see in order how all this is demonstrated to us by an old, pious, and sociable Doctour.

His first Chapter.

First then; "That the doctrin of the Ro-"man Church in the controverted Articles is "neither Catholik, Apostolik, nor Primitive, "he declares in eleven sections, which make up "that his first chapter. First section sayes, that

"the

"the Roman Church pretends a power to make
"new Articles of faith, and doubtles uses that
"power, and for that end corrupts the Fathers,
"and makes expurgatory Indices to alter their
"works. The second, that this power of ma-
"king new articles is a novelty, and yet beleev-
"ed by Papists. Third, that the Roman doctrin
"of Indulgences is unknown to antiquity.
"Fourth, that Purgatory is another novelty,
"Fift, Transubstantiation another. Sixt, Half
"communion another. Seventh, Liturgy in an
"unknown tongue another. Eighth, Veneraci-
"on of Images the like. Ninth, Pictures the
"same. Tenth, the Popes general Episcopacy
"likewise. And the eleventh and last speaks al-
"most as many more all of a heap, to make up
"his one last section, as Invocation of Saints,
"sufficiency of scriptures, absolving sinners
"before penance, simple Priests giving Con-
"firmation, selling Masses for nine pence, cir-
"cumgestation of the Eucharist, intention in Sa-
"craments, Mass-sacrifice, and supper without
"Communion. All this is Popery, all new, and
"therfor the Roman Church is neither Catho-
"lik, Apostolik, nor Primitive. This is the
sum of his first Chapter.

What in the name of God does this Author of the *Dissuasive*, your learned Doctour, mean by the *Church* of *Rome*, and by the *doctrin* of the *Roman Church*? This Sir, is a main busines,

and

and ought, if he had meant sincerity, to have been firmly stated, before any thing were treated, either of the one or the other. But this he utterly here omits, which he should principally have heeded, that he may speak looselv and hand over head, any thing he may deem fit to black his own paper and other mens fame. If he take them as he ought, the *Church of Rome*, for that universality of Catholik beleevers, who live in several kingdoms of the world united in faith and sacraments under the Spirit of Jesus Christ, and one visible Pastour; and *the doctrin of that Church*, for the body of faith and religion handed to them from age to age, as taught and delivered from Christ and his Apostles, which they call in the phrase of St. Paul *Depositum fidei*, or treasure of faith: I say if he mean this by the *Roman Church*, and *doctrin of that Church*, as he ought to do, I will be bold to aver, that ther is not any one claus or period in his book true, and three parts of his book absolutely impertinent. If he mean otherwis then Catholiks themselvs conceiv or profess, he was bound in honour to make his mind known, that the renown of an innocent Religion, and worthy persons might not suffer prejudice by his ambiguous speech. But perhaps he studied how to abuse that Religion, that he may be thought worthy of the dignity and wealth he has now obtained in another, slipt out of it. But concern-

cerning the way he takes to villifie the Roman faith and Church, which is indeed the common road of all her adversaries, I shall speak more fully, if I have time, by and by. Now I hasten to his text, which I shall give, and my own judgment of it very briefly.

§. 1. Which is about Novelties in general.

"Sayes, that the Protestant hath the word of "God, and Gospel, and Apostles writings, and "if need be, the four first general Councels, "and cannot be therfore doubted to be Apo-"stolical; but the Roman Church cannot so "much as pretend, that all her Religion is pri-"mitive, since she pretends a power of making "new articles of faith: for Turrecremata, "Triumphus, Ancorano, and Panormitan af-"firm she can do it. And this power Pope Leo "the tenth challenged, when he condemned "Luther for denying him to have it. To fur-"ther this their pretended power, the Papists "corrupt, and alter the Fathers works: inso-"much that Saurius the corrector of the Press "at Lions, complained to Junius, that he was "forced to blot out many sayings of St. Am-"brose, which had been in a former edition "printed there. For this care of purging Ca-"tholik writers Sixtus Senensis commends Pope "Pius. Nay, they correct the very Indexes "made by Printers, as those of Probens and "Chevallonius.

Thus the Doctour begins his book: and I cannot but commend his wit. For he wisely assumes that to himself, which is the very one great busines, wherin every particular controversie sticks, and which, if it were once agreed on, would put an end to all controversies, that either now are, or ever shall be in the world. For they all com at length to this question, which of the many Professours of Christianity, now so much divided in their wayes, have the Gospel and word of God on their side, in this, that, and the other particular. *We*, saith Dr. Taylor, *we Protestants have the word of God, we have the Gospel of Christ, we have the Apostles writings with us and for us, and therfor our Religion is for certain, both ancient, primitive, and Apostolical.* This is, Sir, a very good consequence, That Religion must needs be ancient, which hath God for his Author, that must be a primitive Christianity which Christ founded, and what the Apostles writings confirm, must needs be Apostolical faith. But is it proved here by the Doctour, that Protestants and not Catholiks have the word of God and of Christ, and of his Apostles on their side? No, it is all supposed: and his whose endeavour is to tell us, that the religion which issued from God and Christ, and his holy Apostles, must needs be Apostolical, primitive, and ancient. He supposes Protestancy, as distinct from Catholik faith,

to

to have com all of it from those divine hands, which is the only thing to be proved: and declares at large, that a religion which came from such hands, must needs be ancient and primitive; which is a thing no man can ever doubt.

It is certain and manifestly known, that Protestants received both Law and Gospel, and Apostles writings, from the hands of Roman Catholiks, who had kept and canonized, and lived by those rules fifteen hundred years before Protestancy rose up in the world, and all the whole hundred years since. The only question is about the sence and mind of that holy writ, in the many particular points now controverted in the world. He has the law, that has the mind and purpos and meaning of the law; not he that hath the form of words without it. This is the great business, and the very extract and quintessence of all controversies: which your quick Doctour assumes as granted on his side, without any more ado. *We*, saith he, *we Protestants have the Law and Gospel, and Apostles writings, and the old Councels too if need be, and therfor is not the ancientness of our Religion to be doubted. But the Papists!* what of them? *the Papists Religion cannot so much as be pretended to be Apostolical, old, or primitive.* Why so? Have not they the law and Gospel, and Apostolical writings? He does not plainly say they have not, but he hopes his reader will think so. What

then of the Papists? *They*, saith he, *can make new Articles, and therfor cannot their Religion be antient.* Sir, although they could make new articles, so long as they do not, their Religion may be old still for all that. A man may live in an old house, although he be able to build a new one. And this seems indeed to be the case here. For the Disswader in confirmation of his speech, brings in, although unjustly, the testimony of som Catholik Doctours, who should say, *The Church can make new Articles*; but not one that sayes she has made any. That I may yet go further; although the Church should make new obliging Articles: so long as these do not contrary the former, but declare them more amply in such and such circumstances, they annull not, but rather confirm and explicate the old ones. Is not our Law the same old Law of England, and we the same polity our fore-fathers were, although the King and Parliament upon occasion of new disorders, make new acts and statutes continually? But let us go on, yet one step more.

The Roman Church does plead, Sir, whatever your Disswader would have you think, that her religion is Catholik, Apostolik, and primitive: becaus all her Counсels, by which that Church is governed, have openly and continually declared, when they came together to decide any affair which had raised new disturbance in-

in the Christian world, that they must firmly adhere to that which is Primitive, to that which is Apostolical, to that which is Catholick, to that which has been delivered and received from fore-fathers. And by that rule they decided the difference. How then can this Church pretend to make new Articles? Does your Doctour bring any General Conncel, which is the loud voice of that Church; or any Tradition, which is the Churches still voice, to speak it? No, not any at all. But this he ought to have done, if he would prove that Church to pretend any such power. What then? Wy, *Turrecramata* and som other doctours sayes, *she can do it.* But Sir, if some one or other clergy-man should think that the Church can make new articles, does it therfor follow, that the Church it self does pretend any such power. Surely the voice of one or two Ministers here in England cannot in reason be thought the voice of our whole Protestant Church, especially when they speak against the tenour of her doctrin and practice. But your Dissuader has been many years picking in cobweb holes, and obscure writings, that he might, where he could find any half sentence apt to be wrested from the common judgment of Catholik Religion, mark that out for Popery; to the end it may be thought either naught or new. This is the chief ingredient of your *Dissuaders* Policy. Catho-

lik Doctours, Sir, though they may have written many other most excellent, catholik, and pious things, yet through humane infirmity, in this and that particular, may they at one time or other trip and fail. And particular mens failings are to be rectified by the straightnes and integrity of the General Canon, but they are not to be esteemed that Canon, as your Doctor Taylor, not inclined to mend things but marre them rather, would here have them to be, thorowout this whole book of his Disswasive; where whatever he can read or hear of amongst the writings of any one in the Catholik world, that may either swerv or be wrested from the universal judgment and beleef of Papists, that he calls Popery: and what they speak, that the Roman Church must pretend. O the strange perversnes and wickednes of mans heart! And yet this book of his thus made up, has carried away, not the weaker sort of men only, but it seems has made even your discretion, Sir, to stagger. For when I gave you lately a visit, I perceived within a while, that I had but gon forth to see a reed shaken with the wind.

What the Church can do, is but one of the Questions of School-divinity, and no Catholik faith: Consequently no Popery. And if two or three in the Schools should chance to over this power in the Church, where more then two or three thousands deny it, why should not

the

the opinion of three thousand Papist doctours be esteemed Popery, as well as that of only three. Whilst all of them agree in their faith, which is, *that the Church hath a power authoritatively to decide controversies*, and dispute only of a further power then their faith reaches unto, I should think, that the opinion of three thousand Papist doctours, is rather to be esteemed Popery, if one of them must be called so, rather then the single opinion of two or three, if any such be to the contrary.

But truth is, ther is no such opinion of any one I know to the contrary. Nor does Turrecremata, nor any els teach, that the Church hath power to make new articles, in that sence your Dr. Taylor means, who therby would infer, that Catholik faith is therfor not primitive, but new. Nay, it is rather Popery, and a part of Catholik faith, that no new articles can be made. For General Councels have determined, that nothing is to be beleeved or held, but id *quod traditum est*, that which has been received from Christ and his Apostles. Nor can the Religion otherwise be the faith of Christ, or Christian Religion. Sir, if you do but seriously peruse the last one general Council, which all Protestants hold to be rank popish; that I mean which was kept at Trent: you will find that they testifie almost in every Session, and profes to make all their determinations according to

that *which had been delivered*, according to that *they had received*, according to that which had *been conserved by continual succession*, to that which was *conformable to Apostolical tradition*, to that which had been perpetually and *uninterruptedly retained*, to that which *ancestours profest*, to that which the Church of *God ever taught*, ever understood, ever beleeved, that which hath been *received down by hands*, that which was the *ancient judgment*, and custom, that which has been *approved* since the apostles dayes, &c. These are all the very words of the Councel in several of their Sessions. And shall a Doctor Taylor com now after all this, and tell the world, *that Popery is neither Catholik, Apostolik, nor Primitive, and that Papists pretend to make new faith*, &c. after a general Synod, which all Protestants look upon, as the most popish Councel that ever was, and that too the last and neareſt to us, hath so manifestly, so pathetically, so generally profest the contrary. What should we say to such a Doctor? And other general Councels in like manner, never determined any thing for the quieting of dissentions, for which end they met together, but what was latent at least in the seed of Christs word, and so no new article in this Doctours sence: as did that Councel for example, which determined two wills in Christ, which was no new article, becaus the former old faith, which had made known two perfect natures in our Lord, the

one

one divine, the other humane, apparently dictated that truth against all those, who would acknowledg but one will in him. And this being defined by the Councel, received a new strength against a novel heresie, but not a new birth. For this cans Councels do not determin the varieties that are in Schoolmen; becaus these are superstructures, and none of them more latent in ancient tradition, than is the opinion that is opposit to it.

But Turrecremata, Triumphus, Ancoran, and Panormitan teach that the Church can make new articles. If they should say any such thing, I have already made it enough evident, that it cannot be thence inferred to be popery, or any part of popery. But what if they speak no such thing? What shall we think then of this your Dr. Taylor? *Turrecremata* in the place cited by him, never so much as dreamed, as any man may there see, that the *Pope is the rule of faith*, as the Doctour would have him speak: but in that whole chapter labours only to shew, that it belongs to him principally to *regulate* disputes in faith, as being the *chief* Prelate. In the like manner does he most unworthily abuse the other three, brought by him as witnesses, that the Pope can make new Creeds, and new faith: whereas Panormitan teaches expressly, that he cannot make, but only declare faith; Ancorano sayes the like, adding that what he so declares,

may

may be new *to us*, though not *in it self*: and Triumphus no less manifestly speaks in the very place cited by him, that ther is one and the same faith in the ancients and moderns; and that in our holy Creed are inserted all those things, which universally pertain to Catholik faith: although he say withall, which is also very true, that to adde, explicate, and declare a truth, which is contained in holy Scripture, hath alwayes been lawful for the Church. But is this to make new faith which is not Apostolik, and primitive, as this your Doctour would have them to assert? Do you Sir, your self judg. And him that thus abuses the world, God Almighty judg. So that when we come to the close of all, ther is not any one Catholik Doctour, that ever said that the Church can make new articles of faith in Doctour Taylors sence.

Why then did Pope Leo the 10. *condemn Luther for denying the Pope to have this power?* Neither did Luther, or Pope Leo ever dream of any such thing. For Luther wholly busied himself about his old Catholik Religion, from which he had revolted, which he called an Egyptian darkness that had overspread the earth even from the Apostles dayes, and never thought of this school question, which in his dayes was not heard of. And he denied the then present Pope who was Leo the tenth, to be any judg in those Controversies of Religion, or to have any

power

power *statuendi*, of deciding or determining in such affairs. Nor is ther any the least mention, either in Luther's resistance, or Leo his censure, about constituting new articles, but only deciding the old, which Luther would have thought to be erroneous, however strengthened by antiquity, and from which old errours he would make himself a reformation and innovation by the right, which was in himself not subjected to any man, no not to the Pope himself in those affairs. Is this a mistake think you in your *Disswader* or something wors? Truly I cannot think he was so ignorant.

The like insincerity doth this your *Disswader* exhibit in all that his talk of the Catholiks dealing with the Fathers works, and the indexes or tables adjoyned to them, jumbling his words so confusedly together, that his reader might beleev that to be don to the Fathers writings themselvs, which the Churches care provided to be done to the false glosses, tables and indexes annexed to those writings; and that to be taken out of those writings, which ever was, and still is in them; and Printers and Correctours complaining of that fault of making alterations in the Fathers Editions, which they did not so much as think of. Which is a most stupendious insincerity. And *thus*, saith he, *are the Fathers maimed and curtailed by Papists; insomuch that Sixtus Senensis praises Pope Pius 5.*

for this his care in purging the Fathers works. I say this whole talk of his is most prodigiously unjust. For that Index Expurgatorius extended not to any writings or works of the Fathers, but only to the marginal notes and false glosses and indexes or tables put to them by the hereticks; and therfor are Tertullian, Origen, and some others still printed intire, though ther be not a few things in them contrary to Catholik faith. And this the very words of Junius a Correctour of a Press cited by the Doctour clearly intimates. *What,* saith he, *Papists dare not do with the Fathers, they practise upon us,* he means Protestant printers and writers: *and with their little forks thrust out our annotations in the margent, and our sayings in the indices, although they be consonant to the Fathers minds.* But, saith he, *this care was so great in Pius 5. that Sixtus Senensis commends the Pope for his industry in purging the Fathers works.* He did so indeed: but if the Doctour had spoken out the sentence, he had betrayed his own false heart, which he would not willingly do. *Expurgari,* saith Senensis, *& emaculari curasti omnium Catholicorum Scriptorum, ac præcipue veterum Patrum scripta, hæreticorum ætatis nostræ facibus contaminata & veneni infecta.* Your Doctour our Dissuader makes Senensis praise the Pope, for his purging the Fathers, as though he had scowred and scraped off the substance: wheras he commended him

only

only for his care in cleansing them from the infectious notes and glosses superadded to them by the hereticks of our times.

But Sir, that I may tell you once for all. The falsifications of Authours perverted by this your Diffwader, are so many, so notorious and gross ones, that in the very relating them I shall tire both my self and you. My design is only to let you know, that this whole work of his *Diffwasive from Popery*, if the proofs and citations he brings for his talk were true, as they are all false, signifies nothing at all. Two worthy Catholik Gentlemen have discovered by the help of the Libraries in London and Oxford so many most gross falsifications, one of them a hundred and fifty, the other yet more and greater, that it cannot but amaze an honest minded reader to behold them. Pray read them Sir, and ponder seriously; and so rid of that trouble, I shall make the more haste in my own design. It was their endeavour it seems to show him to be dishonest, mine is only to prove him impertinent. God reward them for their pains, and help me in mine. For my hand denies me now his office, not able to write with that facility it was wont. But becaus I saw no abler pen to appear, as I thought they would in the confutation of this slanderous book: I judged it my part, Sir, to give you som general hints of light concerning it, till there might issue som more plenary

nary confutation by a better hand. And here, Sir, you must know too, that I had no sooner finished this my Epistle, but that I understood of another book against this Doctour Taylors *Dissuasive*, a very solid book written by Ja. Set. in order to his own book called *Sure-Footing* lately set forth, which made me doubt for a while, whether I should let this of mine appear, especially when I considered the industry, care, and solidity of those three men, the last whereof had so taken up what the other two had left for me to say, and so utterly confounded this Dissuasive, that I might well be silent. But I remembred a story which I had sometime read in holy writ, of Joas the King of Israel, who coming to visit Elizeus the Prophet when he lay sick on his death-bed, was bid by him for his encouragement against his enemies, to *strike the ground with the javelin he had in his hand.* Joas at his word struck the floor three times. But the holy man of God was angry with him and said; *If thou hadst struck five or six or seven times, thou hadst smote Syria even to an utter consummation; but now thou shalt smite it but thrice.* So very faulty is this Dissuasive, that it cannot be smote too often, even to an utter consummation.

§. 2. *Which is about a knack of new Articles.*

"Sayes, that in the Church of Rome faith "and Christianity encreas like the moon: and "that ther be now two new articles of faith a coin-

"coining, namely the immaculate Conception,
"and the Popes being above the Councel: and
"one other lately produced in the Councel of
"Trent, sess. 21. which is, *That although the*
"*antient Fathers did give the Communion to In-*
"*fants, yet they did not believe it necessary to sal-*
"*vation*: Which decree is, saith he, beyond all
"bounds of modesty and evident truth.

Here your Doctour tells news of one Article lately made, and two more a coining, which will shortly be out of the mint: both which news he knows, but we know not. Indeed Sir, this section belongs more to a writer of Diurnals or weakly Intelligencer, than to a Doctour of Divinity. And therfor at the reading of it, I turned suddenly to the frontispiece of the book, to see whose *Imprimatur* it had to it. And I found it licensed, not by Mr. l' Estrange, but Geo. Stradling. First then he tells us news to come, and then news past.

A pair of faith articles are now, he saith, in the mint, and will shortly come forth, *The Virgins immaculate Conception, and the Popes being above a Councel.* But how can your Dissuader say, that these two are shortly to com forth, whereas in this very section he tells us a little afterward, that the Councel of Basil decreed the second Article against the Pope. And I am sure the same Councel of Basil decreed the first article of the immaculate Conception,

sess.

sess. 36. Surely the year of our Lord 1431. when that Councel was kept, is not now to come. Where and when, and how can they be more then they are already? I suppose he propheſies this by reason of som vehement disputes about those points. If this be it, he may adde yet five hundred more, which are more vehemently disputed than these be. One of them it is much he could miss. For the superiority betwixt the King of France and Spain has been often agitated not only by their Embassadours in Kingdoms where they reside, but even in Councels also, and that with too much of vehemency there.

As concerning the Conception, I know the two schools of divine S. Thomas and subtile Scotus have much altercation about an instant of time, an Aristotelical Instant, so swift and short an instant, that no thought of man, though never so nimble, can ever catch it. And the general Pastour has silenced that School-dispute, becaus it sounded ill, and signified nothing. What is it to action, or any esteem towards that Blessed Virgin, that she was pure in her Conception by Gods preventing grace, as one school speaks, or by his sanctifying grace, as the other school declares it; that she was ever Immaculate, Gods mercy providing that in no instant imaginable she should be liable to original sin, as Scotus teaches; or Gods grace so

so working, that immediatly after that instant she should be made pure and holy, as Saint Thomas speaks. For this is the school dispute, which your Disswader, if he understands himself, here talks of. And those very Doctours who dispute this, and all pious Christians have ever unanimously beleeved, that the Blessed Virgin was not only most pure and unsported in her whole life, but even from her first animation in the womb. So that if we speak of a real and complete Conception, she is already beleeved to be Immaculate. And from this universal Tradition, wherin Catholiks agree, and are already resolved, the first reforming Protestants departed, as well as from many others. Nor in any probability will ever that Aristotelical School instant, which signifies just nothing, as to any Christian action, be ever thought of: unless som greater disorder then I have yet heard of, exact a further decision about a thing, which it is not the weight of a hair, whether it be expressed according to the school of S. Thomas or of Scotus.

The like I say to that other article, which your Disswader propheſies will shortly come forth, concerning the *Popes being above a Counsel.* For that ther is, and ought to be, one visible Pastour over all Christs flock upon earth, whether essential or representative, is a Christian Tradition; which Catholiks still embrace.

but Protestants have left. And this tradition, together with the former of the immaculate Conception, if your Dissuader had endeavoured to show, either not to have been, or likely not to be perpetual, his endeavour however insufficient, had not been at least impertinent. But instead of that, he tells us, that this and that will shortly com forth new articles, not heeding that himself and such as he have departed from the old.

And this his prophesie in this, is as vain as in the other. For that the Pope, who is and ever was beleeved the head and Prince of the whole Councel, should be also above it, and his authority there greater then all the rest beside, is a speculative querk, that ambition may think, but sober reason will never deem of moment. For whether he be above the Councel, that is to say, of greater authority then all the other Prelates put together; or not above, but their authority joyned together as great, or greater then his: neither they without him, nor he without them, can politively declare any thing with authentick authority, for the silencing of differences which arise in faith. I'th interim the chief Prelate is for certain above the Councel in this sence: that he is their Prince and Superiour: as also he has in himself a negative voice, both with the Councel, and without it. For this is a right ingrafted naturally in the con-

condition of all whatever superiority, spiritual or civil: without which they could not rule or mannage their charge. By it they silence disquiets, and end debates, according to the tenour of laws already made, which in such cases, they are by their place and office to interpret; so far at least, that one party shall not carry it against the other, which he shall judge in such and such circumstances to com nearer to law and right, than he. This power I say every superiour must have over his subjects, whether his authority be greater then all theirs put together in the making of laws, or not. Nor is it of any concernment at all, since one without the other can enact no laws, that may have their full and perpetual force, which of them is the greater. The statutes and acts that are made in any Kingdom by the King and Parliament of the place, have the same force, whether the Kings Majesty, who is superiour prince, and head of the Parliament, be above the whole Parliament, that is, of more authority than all the rest there put together, and weighed in a ballance against him, yea or no. Nor would he gain or lose any one jot of his dignity, authority, or reverence, whatever should be concluded in a pair of subtil speculatours scales, concerning that point. Although for my part, I hold it little better than busie sedition, to rais such fantastick doubts. And the danger of it we experienced

here in this Kingdom but the other day. And I may be bold to say, by what I know and heard my self, that the hint was given them by Ministers talking upon this point of the Popes not being above his Councel. Catholiks know how to obey their Pope and Pastour, whether he be above or not above a Councel, which silly querk concerns not them to think of. But others are apt to catch fire at any thing, which may any wayes dissolve the bands of their due obedience. Thus much concerning the two points of school-speculation, which your Disswader propheſies will shortly be determined. But he does but dream, and so let him sleep on.

The third new article, is that which was lately produced, saith he, in the Councel of Trent, sess. 21. which is, *That although the ancient Fathers did give the Communion to Infants, yet they did not beleev it necessary to salvation.*

Your Disswader seems here tacitly to grant, that all the other Canons and Decrees of the Councel of Trent are old and primitive doctrin. He would not otherwis have culled out from thence this one only article for new.

I looked into the Councel of Trent, and found there no such article of faith as this your Disswader speaks. The Canon or Article of faith concerning this point runs thus, *Si quis dixerit parvulis, antequam ad annos discretionis pervenerint, necessariam esse Eucharistiæ communionem,*

onem, anathema sit. And this is all the articles of faith determined in that Councel upon this affair: wherein the faithful are forbid to hold that the Communion of Infants is necessary to salvation. *If any one,* sayes the Councel, *shall say, that communion of the Eucharist is necessary to babes before they come to years of discretion, let him be Anathema.* And this doctrin I am perswaded your Disswader himself holds for good. But this would not make him sport enough. And therfor he lets pass the Canon or Article of faith, and speaks of the doctrin or Declaration of it, which is not propounded for faith at all to any beleever, although all Catholiks that know it, adhere to it as good and solid. And this is his first legerdemain, to propound that for an Article of faith, which is only a doctrin or declaration of faith. His next trick is, to make it run short like a Canon of faith, whereas it is a large and serious explication, wherein those words he catches at are so connexed with others, that their rationality there appears, which here is hid. Third is, that he makes it the Councels busines to determin only a matter of fact of the ancient Fathers not beleeving infants communion necessary, though themselves used it: which was none of the Councels intention, but insinuated only by way of anticipation to cut off the arguments of hereticks, who strengthned their errour about the neces-

ceſſity of infants communion, by example of the ancient Fathers who practiſed it. *Denique eadem ſancta Synodus docet parvulos uſu rationis carentes nulla obligari neceſſitate ad Sacramentalem Euchariſtiæ Communionem: Siquidem per Baptiſmi lavacrum regenerati, & Chriſto incorporati, adeptam jam filiorum Dei gratiam in illa ætate amittere non poſſunt. Neque adeo tamen damnanda eſt antiquitas, ſi eum morem in quibuſdam locis aliquando ſervavit. Ut enim ſanctiſſimi illi Patres ſui facti probabilem cauſam pro illius temporis ratione habuerunt, ita certe eos nulla ſalutis neceſſitate id feciſſe ſine controverſia credendum eſt.* Thus ſpeaks the Councel in their doctrin or declaration of that Article of faith. *Si quis dixerit.* But enough of this buſines. And although your Diſſwaders talk deſerv it not, yet your own ſatisfaction concerning theſe three novelties here ſpecified, becaus I thought it might haply require what I have ſaid therof, pray take it in good part. And be aſſured that faith and Chriſtianity in the Roman Church increaſes not like the moon; although out of that Church it decreas indeed like the moon in her wain, daily and in all Reformations to the wors.

§. 3. *Which is about Indulgences.*

"Sayes that the doctrin of Indulgences is "wholly new and unknown to antiquity, as An- "tonius, Prierias, Byſhop Fiſher, Agrippa, and "Duran-

"Durandus, Popish doctours do acknowledg.
"And hence it is, that Gratian and Magister
"sententiarum, both of them eminent doctors
"among the Papists, have not a word of them.
"Indeed in primitive times, when the Bishop
"imposed several pennances, and that they
"were almost quite performed, and a great
"caus of pity intervened her danger of death,
"or an excellent repentance, or that the mar-
"tyrs interreded, the Bishop did somtimes in-
"dulge to the penitent, and relax som remain-
"ing parts of his pennance. But the Roman
"doctrin of Indulgence is another thing. They
"talk of Jubilees and treasure of the Church,
"and pilgrimages, which ancient Fathers ei-
"ther speak against, or never heard of. In fine,
"theirs is becom a doctrin of solution not ab-
"solution, that is, the sinner is to go free with-
"out any punishment: which is destructive to
"true repentance, and right hope, to Christs
"merits, and free pardon, nourishes pride and
"brings in money, condemned by holy Scri-
"ptures and ancient Fathers, who teach repen-
"tance reducing to a good life, faith in Christs
"merits, and hope in his promises. Neither
"can any Papists tell what they are the better
"for their Indulgences; or whether they be
"absolutions or compensations; whether they
"take off actual pennances, or potential; such
"as be due in the court of man, or of God;

"whether they avail, if the receiver do nothing "for them, or not; whether they depend only "of Christs satisfaction, or the Saints like-"wis. And therfor the Councel of Trent durst "determin nothing about all these things, but "contented themselves only to declare this, "*That ther is in the Church a power of granting* "*Indulgences*; advising Catholiks to set other "superfluous and curious questions aside.

Sir, if I had had the opportunity to print the four paragraffs, which to lessen the book I left out of my *Fiat Lux*, becaus one of them was about *Indulgence*, I should need to say the less to this section; wherin I must notwithstanding be brief, that I may speak somwhat also to those that follow.

Three things are in this his third section confusedly jumbled together by your Disswader concerning this busines of *Indulgence*; Faith, School-philosophy, and Abuses. Catholik faith and Tradition he sets down himself p. 17. and acknowledges it for good. *Now lest the Roman Emissaries*, saith he, *should deceiv any of the good sons of the Church, we think it fit to acquaint them that in the primitive Church when the Bysshop imposed severe pennances, and that they were almost quite performed, and a great caus of pitty intervened or danger of death: or an excellent repentance; or that the Martyrs interceded, the Bysshop did sometimes indulge to the Penitent, and relax*

som

som of the parts of his penaunce, and according to the example of S. Paul in the case of the incestuous Corinthian, gave them ease, lest they should be swallowed up with too much sorrow. These are his words. And in them he hath set down exactly, not only the faith, but all the faith of Roman Catholiks in this point, to stop the mouths of Roman Emissaries: which faith and practise he acknowledges also expressly to be antient and primitive. And thus much he would have us beleev that Protestants hold and allow, although not their books and writings only which manifestly gainsay it, but their very practise, which hath long ago abandoned, and is now utterly ignorant either of confession or pennance, or relaxation or indulgence, and the very Articles of the English Protestant Church refute him. But he that writes against Popery, need not heed what he sayes. If another say the contrary, so that he speak against Popery too, they will both pass for good.

But *the Papists*, saith your Disswader, *they are quite gone from this primitive way: their doctrin of Indulgence is another thing, quite another thing.* And then jumbles together heaps of their school-disputes, about solutions, absolutions, compensations, relaxations, and such like stuff; which together with som abuses that time has brought forth, as well in that as other affairs, and which Councels and Pastours have in all

ages

ages endeavoured to rectifie, must make up a Miscellan, which he would have to be thought the Popery of this busines. Good Lord! Is this ignorance in your disswading Doctour, or *illud quod dicere nolo*. He acknowledges manifestly, that the Councel of Trent decided no more than that very Tradition, which the Church hath kept in all ages, acknowledged here by the Disswader himself to be primitive. Nor can he bring any Catholik Councel that hath decided any more, or any Gospel or Tradition for more. If school-divines questions, that are raised beyond faith in this point as well as hundreds of others, may suffice to infer that Roman Catholiks are departed from the ancient primitive way, although they keep it, he may as well say they are departed from the old faith of the Trinity, Creation, Incarnation, Sacraments, Resurrection, Justice, Grace, and the whole contents of the old and new Testament. For though they keep the ancient faith concerning all these things, yet have their schoolmen raised many hundreds, nay thousands of questions and conclusions beyond that faith, that be variously agitated in the schools amongst them. Your Disswaders craft lies in this, that whilst he brings in here these school-disputes for popish faith and popery; and points out eminent Doctours amongst Papists, who witnes these fancies to be new and unknown to antiquity, as

Anto-

Antonius, Prierias, Fisher, Durandus, Maironis, Cajetan; and the Councel of Trent, either not able, or not willing to determin them: he hopes his reader will easily beleev; without much labour of his, that Popery is not only a new foppery, but a confusion inextricable. This is his drift not only in this section, but all his whole book. But he is intangled in his own snare. For if neither the Councel of Trent determined those things, nor yet any other Councel in the Catholik world, nor any ancient Tradition delivered, nor her Doctours acknowledg them, then is ther not any popery therin: nor is popery any such thing.

Wherfor your Dissawader is very angry with the Councel of Trent, for that they would not there, either justifie the abuses, or determin the school-disputes in that point; but rather condemned the one, and exploded the other. I will set down the Councels decree word for word, that you may see without any further discours of mine, how much your Doctour has abused his reader. It runs thus. *Cùm potestas conferendi indulgentias à Christo Ecclesiæ concessa sit, atque hujusmodi potestate divinitus sibi tradita à antiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit, sacrosancta Synodus Indulgentiarum usum Christiano populo maximè salutarem, & sacrorum Conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in Ecclesia retinendum esse docet & præcipit, eosq; anathemate damnat.*

qui

qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi Ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem juxta veterem & probatam in Ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit, ne nimia facilitate Ecclesiæ disciplina enervetur. Abusus verò qui in his irrepserunt, & quorum occasione insigne hoc Indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos & correctos cupiens, præsenti decreto generaliter statuit pravos quæstus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in Christiano populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Cæteros verò qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodocunque provenerunt, cum ob multiplices locorum & provinciarum apud quas hi committuntur corruptelas, commodè nequeant specialiter prohiberi, mandat omnibus Episcopis, ut diligenter quisq; hujusmodi abusus Ecclesiæ suæ colligat, eosq; in prima Synodo Provinciali referat, &c. Thus the holy Councel condemns, and labours with all fatherly and pastourly care possible, to prevent and amend the abuses, which your Disswader here sets down as one part of Popery in this point; and the school-philosophy, which he makes the other part therof, the self same Councel explodes in their decree of Purgatory, which your Disswader calls the mother of Indulgences. *Præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis*, saith the Councel, *ut sanam doctrinam à sanctis Patribus & sacris Conciliis traditam à Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, & ubiq; prædicari*

dicari diligenter ſtudeant. Apud rudem verò plebem difficiliores ac ſubtiliores quæſtiones, quæq; ad edificationem non faciunt, & ex quibus plerumq; nulla ſit pietatis acceſſio, à popularibus concionibus ſecludantur. Incerta item & quæ ſpecie falſi laborant, evulgari, ac tractari non permittent. Ea verò quæ ad curioſitatem quandam aut ſuperſtitionem ſpectant, vel turpe lucrum ſapiant, tanquam ſcandala & fidelium offendicula prohibeant. I would we could ſee our Engliſh Byſhops meete togeather in a Councel, and make ſuch pious and fatherly proviſions againſt ſcandalous books, ſeditious ſermons, and vicious cuſtoms, as this Popiſh Councel has don. They would then give ſom help to temporal authority, and not lay all the burthen upon their ſhoulders, whilſt themſelvs ſit like drones in their fat benefices, and do nothing. But here you may ſee Sir, that all that which your Diſſwader makes here to be Popery; abuſive cuſtoms, and ſchool-philoſophy, is by a general Popiſh Councel expreſly excluded from it. What ſtrange kinde of audacity is this, to call that Popery or Catholik faith, which Catholik Doctours deny, Catholik Councels exclude, and Catholik Profeſſours never think of. But what your Diſſwader knows to be new, he firſt puts that upon Papiſts for their faith; and then tells them that their faith is new.

And your Diſſwader, as I told you before, is much

much troubled, and murmurs bitterly against the Councel of Trent: for that they would not determin those philosophical subtilties, whether Indulgences be solutions or absolutions, whether donations or compensations, whether for potential or actual pennances, whether in the Court of God or man, whether out of the treasure of Christ or Saints, whether upon condition of doing something or nothing. *The Councel*, quoth he, *slubbereth all the whole matter both in the question of Indulgences and Purgatory, in general and recommendatory terms; affirming that the power of giving Indulgence is in the Church, and that the use is wholesom; and that all hard and subtile questions concerning Purgatory, (which although if it be at all, it is a fire, yet is it the fuel of Indulgences, and maintain them wholly) and all that is suspected to be false, and all that is uncertain: and whatsoever is curious and superstitious, scandalous, or for filthy lucre, be laid aside. And in the mean time they tell us not what is and what is not superstitious, nor what is scandalous, nor what they mean by the general term of Indulgence. And they establish no doctrin, neither curious nor incurious. Nor durst they decree the very foundation of this whole matter the Churches treasure, neither durst they meddle with it, but left it as they found it, and continued in the abuses, and proceed in the practice, and set their Doctours as well as they can to defend all the new curious and*

scan-

scandalous questions, and to uphold the gainfull trade. Thus heavily poor man does your Disswader complain of the Councels silence in those philosophical points, neither resolving the doubts, nor so much as explicating the terms therof, that he might understand, what is superstitious, and what is scandalous, and what they mean by Indulgence, and what by curious, and the like hard words. Ith' interim while the Councel sends him to school to learn the meaning of those hard words, and the result of those disputes, which belonging not to faith, make little to edification, and from whence no accession to piety can be made, nor indeed any useful knowledg, all your Dissuaders sport is spoiled. And he has som reason indeed to complain and weep. But I pray you Sir consider; If I have a releasement granted me from som temporal penalties due to my misdoings, what does it concern me to know, whether that releasement be a substance or an accident, whether it be in the predicament of quantity or quality, whether it be a solution or absolution, whether it be from power or bounty, whether it issue as out of a treasure, or from a tribunal, or the like. The Schoolmen whence your Doctour picked those curious questions, would I am sure have acquainted him with their opinions concerning all such things, if he had staid to read their answers. But he was in haste, and indeed it concerned

cerned him not to know their resolution. He had enough, to pick out their philosophicall prattle in the general heads of it, which becaus it is found in the school-books of such as are Catholik beleevers, he makes no doubt, but the very naming of it will suffice to persuade the Land, that it is all popish doctrin and Popery, and that Papists cannot agree in it; and that it is new. Indeed Sir, he has great need to go to school to those Doctours, not only to hear their resolutions, but to understand the very terms of the question. For had he known, what those very words of *solution* and *absolution* mean, he had never added that absurd interpretation of his own, which he gives p. 20. *It is a very strange thing*, saith he, *a solution not an absolution, that is the sinner is let go free without punishment in this world, or world to come:* a wise interpretation of a pittiful Divine.

But I cannot stand here to give notice of his special mistakes, simple inferences, vain insultings, and particular falsifications, all which are gross and various. I do only assure you Sir, that if he mean by Popery the Religion and faith of Roman Catholiks concerning this busines of Indulgences, in one period above named, he approves, establishes, and ratifies it all. And in all the rest he sayes nothing against it, and indeed nothing at all to it. For the subtile curious theories that are made by wits upon this sub-

subject, over and above what their faith extends unto, as well as in all other things even from the worlds first creation to its final consummation, all whatever is contained in the whole Bible, about which they have raised many thousands of disputes, over and above that which is there plainly delivered by their faith; these for such as are at leasure and love them, may serve for Academick exercise and discours. The disorders and abuses that have been in this, as well as other affairs, all good men and sacred Councels have laboured to their power to suppress and rectifie. And are ther not abuses of all kinds in the Protestant world, notwithstanding any endeavors to the contrary? But the faith that is in this point and all the whole practice of it, Catholiks still hold, and Protestants have forsaken it: For these have neither confession of sins, nor pennance for those sins confest, nor indulgence of any such pennances injoyned, as Catholiks have. Indeed the Prelat Protestant keeps still one ancient custom of *commuting*, as they call it, which is but a new word for *Indulgence*, when the pennance of standing in a white sheet for one kind of sin imposed, is upon som considerations released. For although the Reformation have taught, that Matrimony is no Sacrament, but a meer secular contract, yet Ministers I know not how keep still that Spiritual Court (as they call it) unto themselves; as

being it seems the only men that are able to judg in those affairs. But there be other sins that require pennance and satisfaction, besides that one: and other pennance besides a white sheet to be *commuted*.

§. 4. *Which is about Purgatory.*

"Sayes that Purgatory is another ill novelty: both becaus the Greek Fathers never "make any mention of Purgatory, and also becaus the doctrins on which it is built are either fals or at least dubious; as that there is "distinction betwixt mortal sins and venial; "that sin may be taken away, the obligation "to punishment remaining; that God requires "of us a full exchange of pennances for the "pleasure of sin, notwithstanding Christ suffering for us. But Papists are deceived in this "point upon two mistakes, the first whereof is, "that ancient Fathers used to pray for the "dead: but they prayed not in relation to Purgatory: and so the Church of England allows to pray for the departed, namely as the "Fathers did. The second is, that the Fathers "speak of a fire of purgation after this life, "which was but an opinion of such a thing after the day of judgment. And this is also refuted by those other Fathers, who hold the "souls to be kept in secret receptacles untill "dooms-day, which opinion cannot stand with "Purgatory. Beside St. Austin in his time,

"doubt-

"doubted whether Purgatory was, or no. And "though ancient Fathers speak much of inter- "medial states and purgations, and fires, and "common receptacles and delivery of souls, "yet they never agreed throughout with the "Church of Rome. But Papists have been "brought into this beleef by frightful relati- "ons of apparitions, which the wiser sort be- "leev not. And Tertullian denies that the "souls of the dead do ever appear. How the "Greek Church denies this purgatory doctrin, "appears in the Councel of Florence. More- "over S. Cyprian and others teach against it, "that after death is no place for pennance, no "purgation: and no less holy scripture, who "saith, Blessed are those who dye in the "Lord.

What a rapsody of stuff is here? *Papists gathered this doctrin of Purgatory out of fals grounds: Papists have been frighted into this doctrin of Purgatory by apparitions. The Fathers speak of a fire of purgation after this life, but they meant not as Papists do. The Fathers held secret receptacles for souls until dooms-day, but that cannot stand with Papists Purgatory: though they speak much of intermedial states, yet that does not agree throughout with the Roman doctrin of Purgatory. And blessed are the dead, for they rest from their labours.* Blessed surely had your Dissuader been, if he had rested from his labours too.

Sir, if your Diſſwader had meant to ſay any thing to the purpos in this affair, he ſhould have clearly ſet down in this his ſection, before he had diſcourſed further, what is the Papiſts beleef and practice in this buſineſs. But this he utterly omits and neglects to do, leſt he ſhould ſpoil his own ſport; and thinks it enough, in a rambling talk to ſay, that *the Fathers prayed for the dead, the Fathers ſpoke much of intermedial ſtates, but no Greek Fathers, no Latin Fathers agree with the Roman doctrin of Purgatory, S. Cyprian denied it, S. Auſtin doubted it, the Scripture is againſt it, the grounds for it are dubious, apparitions for it are frivolous.* And he never ſpeaks one word what that Roman doctrin of Purgatory is: nor can I imagin what he fancies it to be. If he do but ſpeak againſt it, be it what it will, he has ſaid enough. So he thinks. But Sir, had he declared it as he ought to have don, it had then clearly appeared, that thoſe Fathers who prayed for a joyful Reſurrection to their friends departed, who ſpeak of a fire of purgation after this life, of an intermedial ſtate and purgations and delivery of ſouls thence, were directly and perfectly of the now preſent Papiſts beleef: and that St. Auſtins doubting, whatever it was, and the Greeks diſagreeing in Florence, and S. Cyprians affirming that ther is no place of repentance after this life, ſo far as they are truly cited, ſtand all very well, perfect,

and

and completely with the Roman Catholik beleef and practice.

But what think you, Sir, of our Englisſh Proteſtant Church? Does ſhe pray, or ſo much as leave it indifferent to pray for the dead, as this Diſſwader ſpeaks, if it be not don in relation to Purgatory? the name Purgatory I mean. For if they pray for the refreſhment, eaſe, and comfort of ſouls departed as ancient holy Fathers did, ther is nothing els but the bare name remaining, if thoſe prayers bear any ſence. Hath the Proteſtant Church any altar, or prieſthood, or ſacrifice for the dead, which all ancient Fathers both Greek and Latin ſpeak of, as the uſage and cuſtom of the Chriſtian Church in their times? Does any amongſt them, when he dies, give alms either to prieſts or poor people, or other friends to pray for his ſoul when he is departed hence? Is not he looked upon, that ſhall be heard to ſay for his deceaſed friend, *God give him reſt*, or *God grant him a joyful Reſurrection*, as either ſom profeſt, or at leaſt a tacit and concealed Papiſt? What is it this Doctour then tells us, of the Engliſh Churches allowing prayer for the dead, which our very Proteſtant articles condemn, and all their writers have hitherto oppoſed. Nor have they any Prieſts amongſt them to perform any ſuch rite in that way the Fathers ſpeak of, and uſed themſelves on their altars, which are all razed

here to the ground. And as for the people, they neither do, nor dare, under the danger of being thought Papists, if they had the mind, either practise or commend any such custom.

But Greek Fathers never mention Purgatory, a Polydor and Roffensis witness. Where does Polydor and Roffensis witness that? How would your Disswader have them mention it? *Purgatorium* is a latin word, and not to be found in greek writings. Did not S. Basil pray to God, *for rest and pardon for the soul of thy servant N. N.* Does not S. Chrysostom speak of his offering sacrifice *for all those who slept before us, &c. and for the rest and pardon of thy servant N &c.* Does not S. Cyril frequently say, *We offer this sacrifice for our deceased Fathers and Bishops, and all those who have departed this life, &c.* And S. Epiphanius, *We make mention both of just and sinners, &c.* And what is the Papists Purgatory for Gods sake, but only such a condition of souls deceased, as requires help from the prayers of the faithful living. This I take to be the Roman doctrin, or Catholik beleef, both of the Eastern and Western part of the Church, both Greeks and Latines, wherein all ancient Christians unanimously agreed. And your Disswader, that he may leave it free for every mans thoughts to imagin what he lists, never speaks himself what it should be.

But the Fathers prayed for those who perhaps never

never were in Purgatory, as Apostles, &c. And they prayed too for those who perhaps were there, or in that condition that required their prayers. Truth is, they prayed far differently for the just ones and other men: as any one may see in those very Fathers, insinuated in those your Diswaders words. And if for just ones commemorated by the Fathers wanted not our prayers, does this infer that no condition of souls deceased wants them, or that those Fathers who prayed also for others then deceased, as wanting those helps, although in another manner than for the just, should think so? I trow not, however your Doctour throws his ink about confusedly to blind our eyes.

But S. Austin doubted whether there were any Purgatory or no. And is it likely Sir, that he who in his *Enchiridion. Cura pro mortuis. Civitate Dei* and several other of his works speaks so expressly of souls expiation after death, and of the sacrifices which himself made being a Priest for souls deceased, in particular for his mother Monica, and her husband, for that end so expressly I say and clearly, that no Roman Catholik now, either does or could possibly say more, should doubt whether there were after this life any expiatory place or condition?

I will but set down two or three places of many in that holy Fathers works, which may suffice to show his mind. *Temporarias poenas alii*

in hac vita tantùm, alii post mortem, alii & nunc & tunc patiuntur. l. 21. de Civitate Dei. Again, *Orationibus vero sanctæ Ecclesiæ & sacrificio salutari, & eleemosynis quæ eorum spiritibus erogantur, non est dubitandum mortuos adjuvari, ut cum eis misericordius agatur à Domino, quam eorum peccata meruerunt: hoc enim à patribus traditum universa observat Ecclesia.* De verb. apost. serm. 34. Again, *Neq; negandum est defunctorum animas pietate suorum viventium relevari, cum pro illis sacrificium mediatoris offertur,* Ench. c. 10. The Dissuader cannot but have read several such like passages in that eminent Doctor. And the jest is, that the place he cites for S. Austins doubting of Purgatory, is one of those wherin he expresly teaches it. So expert a Doctour is this of yours. What is it then St. Austin doubted? For he must needs doubt somthing. Otherwise ther had been nothing for your Dissuader to catch hold of. Speaking therfor of those sufferings after this life, before eternal bliss can be obtained, in which condition such as upon a good foundation have built som light matter, which the Apostle calls wood, hay, and straw, may be saved, yet so as by fire, S. Austin doubts whether those very affections men bear to things in this life, which are lawfully had, but lost with som grief, may not burn, and afflict them in that place of expiation, as well as other venial offences, and be som part of the wood, hay,

hay, and straw the Apostle mentions. And truly the doubt is very rational, and remains still a doubt. But when your Disswader takes hereupon occasion to say, that St. Austin doubted Purgatory, I cannot doubt but that he wanted either sincerity in his heart, or eyes in his head.

But in the time of Otho, in the twelfth age of the Church, the doctrin of Purgatory was got no further than a Quidam asserunt, *Some say so.* Sir, Otho here cited to say *quidam asserunt*, speaks not at all of any expiation after death, as your Disswader would have us think, but after judgment, which som divines in those dayes held over and above that which their faith had delivered: which opinion had then but a *some say so* for it, as it hath also now: and it was then, and is now but a philosophical opinion. Can you beleev your Disswader did not see this? It was truly, if he did see it, a gros and inexcusable insincerity, to make Otho say it was only the opinion of som, that ther was a purgation after death, who expressly treats of that particular opinion concerning a purgation after judgment, which their faith and religion did not reach unto. But as I told you before, I must not insist upon your Disswaders falsifications, however they be various and very gros, becaus that work is well don already, and my design looks another way. As he is to blame, for making

making som Fathers think and speak what they did not; so is he, while he makes all the Fathers in general to acknowledg and practise as much in this point, as any Roman Catholik believs, and yet addes withall, that those Fathers not withstanding agreed not with the Roman doctrin, which himself never declares what it is, most palpably ridiculous.

But *the doctrin of Purgatory is grounded*, saith your Disswader, *upon false principles, as upon a supposed distinction betwixt venial sins and mortal, between sin and its obligation to punishment*, &c. Sir, if we would speak properly, neither is this beleef of future expiations, nor any other point of Catholik Religion to be called a *doctrin*, or *opinion*, or *judgment*, of som divines or all divines, or any such like thing. For it is the faith as well of divines, as other Christians; unto which they as well as these submit all equally with the same resignation, and no doctrin of any mans. Upon the pin of this one mistake, if it be a mistake, and not rather a malicious wilfulness, hangs all this your Doctors Disswasive, which being removed, all his whole book falls to the ground. And therfor it were worth the labour to discours more copiously upon this subject; which all Anticatholiks either understand not, or dissemble, that they may have the more ample field of scholastical Divines, and som rotten Casuists to ride a hunting

ing in, when they chase Popery; which the world must beleev to be a doctrin of divines. And this doctrin must not be the doctrin of any one of their schools, much less of all their schools, but of this or that obscure man, who followed no school at all: nor any good thing that he delivered, but som uncouth odd speech unheedfully dropt from his pen: nor this candidly delivered neither, as he spoke it, but wrested and perverted against his meaning. And this is the mode of chasing that wild beast of Popery, with seven heads and ten horns, made by the slight of ministers both terrible, and yet at the self-same time ridiculous to people: not to all: for God be thanked there be very many grave and wise men in the land, but only to the inferior and more numerous sort of people, such as will stand to hear Jack Pudding talk in Bartholomew Fair. But I have not now time to enlarge my self upon this subject, as it may deserv. I say then that no Catholik faith, which ministers expres by the odious name of Popery, is properly speaking, any mans doctrin, much less is it a doctrin grounded upon this or that principle, as indeed all school-doctrin is; but it is a Catholik faith and beleef, grounded immediately upon the veracity and truth of the Revealer our Lord and his Apostles. But your Disswader speaks still of doctrin, and Roman doctrin, and grounds of doctrin, as if he were

utter-

utterly unacquainted with faith, Christian faith, and of all he is to speak; imagining Religion to be som school conclusion of Philosophers; wherein he is either notoriously mistaken, or would in his heart have others most notoriously to mistake. Wherfor, although I could easily defend those scholastical grounds, wheron he sayes the doctrin of Purgatory is built; yet I must first tell him that which is of more concern both for himself and others to know; namely that those are not, be they true or fals, any grounds of Purgatory at all: nor is Purgatory a doctrin built upon those grounds. What then are those assertions, that *som sins are mortal, som not, that the pardon of sin may stand with an obligation to temporal punishment, &c.* They are, Sir, rational congruities invented by Catholik Divines, the more fully to clear unto weak beleevers the rationality and truth of that old Christian Tradition concerning our expiatory sufferings after this life, before entrance into glory. But if we will look for more ancient and Christian-like grounds for this expiation, so far as one busines of faith may be said to be grounded on another, (even as Gods attributes are said by school-divines one to flow from the other, namely in order to our understanding, which cannot otherwise think or speak of that most simple and infinit being) the great *depositum fidei* affords other grounds, far bet-

better, more intelligible, ſimple and eaſie grounds of Purgatory, than thoſe your Diſſwader catches at, although even they be ſolid and good ones too. As for example theſe; Chriſtians are culled and called out of darknes by the mercy of their gracious Redeemer unto purity, light and holines, which they are to practice and act all their whole life after: and if they do otherwiſe, they ſhall ſuffer accordingly, ſo much of pain as they have had of unlawful pleaſures, to the deſpight of that precious blood, that redeemed and brought them out of ſin and darknes, and of that holy Spirit of his, wherwith they have been anointed; every one as he hath acted in his body, whether good or evil, being to receiv accordingly after this life. So that he who ſhall at all times, cooperating faithfully with Gods holy grace, keep his hands pure, and heart clean from ſuch enormities, as may violate friendſhip with his Redeemer, ſhall be in another condition at his departure, then he who hath in his life time polluted himſelf and don injury to the ſanctifying blood of Chriſt by his many filthy adulteries, drunkenneſſes, cheats, ſlanders, murders, or the like, although by Gods grace, he ſhould find mercy at his laſt hour. Theſe, if I could ſtand to enlarge my ſelf upon them, being themſelves Chriſtian Traditions and Apoſtolical doctrin, might in ſom ſence be ſaid to be the grounds of expiatory penalties

after

after this life, commonly called Purgatory. But those others which your Dissuader mentions, are but som congruities latelier put together by Doctours to clear unto unstable Christians, as far as they may be able, the rationality of their Christian Tradition concerning expiations after this life: which Preachers in their sermons, and Doctours in their chairs usually invent and utter as well in this affair as other businesses of faith, som with more firmitude and som with less, according to their learning and capacity: I say they are congruities for it, and good ones too: but no grounds of it. For faith is not deduced by reasons, or drawn from premises, or concluded from grounds. And although this faith be manifold and about sundry matters, as the Creation, Redemption, Justification, Resurrection, and the like, yet all these particular faiths, depend immediatly like several raies on one sun, upon the one only authority and truth of the first Revealer, which is the foundation and ground of all. And if those above-named assertions be no grounds of this faith concerning future expiations, much less is that true and firm tradition, *Blessed are those that dye in our Lord*, any ground against it. For they are happy, and happy that ever they were born who dye in our Lord: that is to say, in his faith and fear, in his love and grace. But ther are as many degrees of dying in our Lord, as ther be varieties

eties of the lives and actions of those that dye in him. And they all rest from the labours of this life, and som also are freed from the pains of the other, who depart hence in a more complete reconciliation with him.

§. 5. *Which is about Transubstantiation.*

"Sayes that Transubstantiation is another "novelty in the Roman Church, so much a no- "velty, that we know the very time of its "birth, and how it was introduced. For Sco- "tus, Occam, Biel, Fisher, Bassolis, Cajetan, "Melchior Caen acknowledg, that it is not ex- "prest in Scripture; and in Peter Lombards "time they knew not whether it was true or no. "Durandus a good Catholik after the Lateran "Councel where it was first declared, said it "was not faich, as Scotus sayes it was no faith "before it: Nor did the Lateran Councel de- "termin that which now the Roman Church "holds: which doctrin of theirs is a stranger "to antiquity, as Alphonsus à Castro acknow- "ledges: and the same is made good by the te- "stimonies of Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Euse- "bius, Macarius, Ephrem, Gregory Nazian- "zen, Chrysostom, Austin, the Canon law it "self, Theodoret, and Pope Gelasius, who all "witness that the bread is our Lords body spi- "ritually. And your Dissuader therfor advises "his charge, to take heed they be not led away "by rhetorical words, to believ the Roman "doctrin

" doctrin, which is an innovation and danger-
" ous practice: about which they make many
" fooliſh queſtions: as whether a mouſe may
" run away with her maker, whether a Prieſt is
" the Creatour of God, &c. In fine, Tranſub-
" ſtantiation is abſolutely impoſſible. For
" Chriſts glorious body cannot be broken, nor
" yet the mere accidents, nor one body multi-
" plied, as be many wafers; and it is againſt the
" demonſtration of our ſences.

Sir, I know well enough, that Tertullian, Juſtin Martyr, Euſebius, Macarius, Ephrem, Gregory Nazianzen, Theodoret, Chryſoſtom, and S. Auſtin, were all of them not only Roman Catholiks, but Catholik prieſts too, and could eaſily prove it. But if your Diſſwader ſhould have the confidence to deny that: I hope yet he will grant me, that Scotus, Occham, Biel, Baſſolis, Cajetan, Melchior Caen, Durand, and Alphonſus à Caſtro Papiſh School-men and Doctours of the Church, and Friars, were all ſuch: and as for Biſhop Fiſher, Peter Lombard, and Pope Gelaſius, theſe I may almoſt preſume he will let paſs for Papiſts. What is then this Roman doctrin, which ſo many Roman Doctours, whereof each one had ſuch a multitude of diſciples and followers in the Catholik world, do not ſo much as acknowledg? Where ſhall we finde it? For your Diſſwader names heaps of Popiſh Doctours, that deny it,

and

and not any one that owns it; nor ever so much as tells us what it is. What strange kind of proceeding is this? Nay in the beginning of the section, he tells us that this *Popery of Transubstantiation is so new, that it is well enough known to have begun in the Councel of Lateran*; and yet in the middle of the very same section sayes expressly, that the *opinion was not determined in the Lateran Councel, as it is now held at Rome.* The Popery or popish doctrin of Transubstantiation now held at Rome, it is very well known to all, saith he, that it had its first beginning in the Lateran Councel, and yet addes, that the opinion was not determined in the Lateran Councel, as it is now held at Rome. What opinion, Sir, was determined in the Lateran Councel, and what is that which is now held at Rome? Does not your Disswader speak of the doctrin now held at Rome, when beginning his section, he speaks thus? *The doctrin of Transubstantiation is so far from being Primitive and Apostolick, that we know the very time it began to be owned publickly for an opinion, and the very Councel in which it passed for a publick doctrin*; which Councel two or three lines afterward he sayes was the *Councel of Lateran under Pope Innocent the third, twelve hundred years after Christ.* And against that new doctrin which began, he sayes, twelve hundred years after Christ, and thereby convicted of novelty, he writes this

his whole section. What means he then in the name of God, but only two pages after, namely p. 39. to say, that the *opinion was not determined in the Lateran as it is now held at Rome.* Is that opinion now held at Rome, younger or older than the Councel Lateran, and when began that opinion held at Rome, or was it from the beginning? And against which of the opinions does he speak in this section? For against both of them together he cannot. The very head and principal, and as it were the summe of all his discours in this section, *The doctrin of Transubstantiation is so far from being Primitive and Apostolick, that we know the very time it began, and the Councel it passed for a doctrin, &c. It was but a disputable question till the Councel of Lateran in the time of Pope Innocent* 1200. *and more after Christ, &c.* This I say cannot agree with the doctrin now held at Rome, which he sayes afterward is *another thing from that which was determined in the Councel of Lateran.* If then this parcel of Popery, which he sayes in one place, is not that which was determined in the Councel of Lateran, and in another place is that which was determined in the Councel of Lateran, be the matter and subject of his discours in this section, ought he not in plain terms to have told us, what this piece of popery is, that we may know what he speaks of. Surely he ought. If it neither be owned by so many

many popish doctours which here he names, and names not any one popish doctour that owns it: if it neither be determined in the Councel of Lateran, nor he himself can name any other Councel wherein it was lately or otherwise determined, how is it Popery? What doctours own it? What Councel has declared it? What people profes it? And what is that thing they should profes, declare, or own? What is it I say? This he ought to have spoken openly, sincerely, and plainly. And yet he endeavours not at all, which he should one would think have principally heeded, either to set down what doctours own it, or what it is they own: but spends his whole time in telling us only of a great company of popish doctours that like not of that Roman doctrin, which he never declares himself what it is. And then exhorts all his charge and all good people to take heed of that Roman doctrin, that scandalous doctrin, that blasphemous novelty, which was determined in the Councel of Lateran, and yet is another thing from that which was determined in the Councel of Lateran; not any part of Catholik beleef until that Councel, nor yet esteemed to belong to faith after that Councel, by the greatest of popish doctours, about which they make many foolish questions, as whether a mouse may run away with her maker, &c.

Sir, your Doctour, who pretending a Dis-

ſwaſive from Popery, by which he doubts not but his reader will underſtand the Roman Catholik faith, never meant to touch at all their real Religion, which is univerſally in their hearts and hands, and no power of man is able to confute, but either ſom obſcure parcels of philoſophy, or abuſes of men, which he is better able to make ſport withall, was fallen here it ſeems upon the Catholik faith, afore he was aware. And therfor he ſuddenly drew back; and ſo blundered up and down in the affrightment, that he ſeems neither to know what to ſpeak, nor againſt what he is to ſpeak of. *The Roman doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation was firſt determined in the Lateran Councel: The opinion was not determined in the Lateran Councel, as it is now held in Rome.* What would this man have? What does he ſpeak of? What opinion, is that which is now held in Rome, differing from that of the Lateran Councel? What is that doctrin of the Lateran Councel, differing from that is now held in Rome? What is that Rome? the Church of Rome or Court of Rome, the City of Rome or ſchools in Rome? And is it in all Rome or ſom particular ſtreets, or pariſhes, or ſchools, or ſhops? And how do they hold it? with their hands or teeth, or pens or hearts? as a matter of faith, or buſines of diſpute, as deſivered to them, or invented by them, in their confeſſion of Religion, or profeſſion of Philoſophy?

losophy? These things ought all of them to have been expreſt, that we might rightly underſtand who in Rome hold it, and how they hold it, and what is that ſame *It* they hold. But your Diſſwader hopes, that upon thoſe general words of his, *The opinion was not determined in the Lateran Councel, as it is now held in Rome*, his unwary reader will be bold to think more, than he dares himſelf utter. And perhaps he is not deceived. For few readers are wiſer than their book.

But *the Romans make many fooliſh and blaſphemous queſtions about it.* The more blaſphemous and fooliſh they, who urge them to it; if any one amongſt them have reſolved ſuch doubts, as infidelity in deriſion of holy things hath raiſed. They who aforetime denied Gods Incarnation, gave occaſion of as fooliſh and blaſphemous diſputes as any theſe be. And if any then ſtudied to give an anſwer to ſuch fordid, unmanly, and ſcurrillous oppoſition, although they might fail in diſcretion, yet their heart was innocent, and intention good.

The buſines which I ſuppoſe your Doctour would be at here, is the real preſence of our Lords bleſſed and glorious body under the ſpecies of corruptible elements, which is one of the paragraffs I left out of my *Fiat*. And I am ſorry now with all my heart it was left out: becaus here is no time or place to treat of it, as

that great and weighty subject would require. Neither is it my intention here to declare the old Christian Tradition: but only to give you, Sir, to understand, that this Dissuader, though he may hurt his unwary reader, yet he nothing at all indammages the old Catholik faith, by any words of his, which speak it to be new. Large volumes have been written upon this subject, enough to satisfie any moderate well disposed mind: *qui legit intelligat.*

Let me only give you notice Sir, that this parcel of Christian faith now abolisht here in England, was so antient, that the very old Pagans and Jews derided the primitive Christians above a thousand years ago, for their worshipping a breaden God, as they pleased then, and the infidels of our times are not ashamed now, to misname that sacred mystery: It was so universally believed, that their adversaries by that only mark expressed as it were in short the very substance of their Religion; *Since the Christians adore that which they eat*, said one of the Infidel writers, well enough acquainted with the cours of Christian Religion, *let my soul be with Philosophers:* It was so sure and undoubted in their hearts, that som ancient holy Fathers have elucidated the mystery of the Incarnation, by this of the real presence in the Eucharist, as the more manifest: It was so grave and solemn, that all the Churches or Temples in the Chri-

stian

stian world, were built principally for it: and the devotion of those times studied to erect them with a strength and magnificence answerable, as far as they could, to the majesty of that divine mystery: It was such a princely leading point of faith, that it drew all other pieties after it, frequent prayers and meditations, almsdeeds, contrition for sins, singing of psalms, hymns and canticles in the Quire before that presence in the Altar, Confessions, Sermons, Catechise, Processions, Fasts, Festivals, and all that real fear and love of God, that has been ever found in Christian hearts: Finally, it is the very legacy of Jesus Christ the holy One, to his Spouse the Church, whereby he proved himself both to be a poor and most loving and also omnipotent Espouse. Another man might leave wealth and possessions, but though he be never so kind and loving, he cannot leave his body to his wife, to remain ever with her for exercise of her love, for comfort of her heart, and glorifying of her soul, by vertue whereof she should be raised up to follow and joyn with him in the eternal glory of another world. This was a Testament only fit for Jesus Prince of Angels and men to make. And this I suppose is that piece of Popery, your Dissuader here so fumbles at, that he knows not what to call it, or how to express it in his words.

O, *but it is Transubstantiation which the Dis-*

ſwader diſlikes. And what *is* Tranſubſtantiation? what does it mean? What is that long winded hard word of Tranſubſtantiation, what is the meaning of it? For Catholik Religion, which your Diſſwader calls Popery, is not words: nor are words Catholik Religion; but the ſence, and life, and meaning delivered us by help of words for faith, hope, and charity to feed upon. Neither Conſubſtantiality, nor Trinity, nor Incarnation, nor Tranſubſtantiation, and ſuch other like phraſes, are any thing at all of any Religion. Your Diſſwader abuſes the world, when he tells you, he knows when Tranſubſtantiation firſt came up. The meaning of it was in the Chriſtian world, all thoſe many ages before that Lateran Councel he ſpeaks of: or elſe it had not been in the world then. Pray let him tell me, whether the *conſubſtantiality* of the Son of God with his eternal Father who made all things, be a novelty or new article, yea or no. *He knows the very time*, as himſelf here ſpeaks, *when it began to be owned publickly for an opinion, and that very Councel in which it was ſaid to be paſſed into a publick doctrin, and by what arts it was promoted, and by what perſons it was introduced.* And if he do not know all this, I can tell him. Does this prove that ſame *Conſubſtantiation* to be a novelty yea or no? Let him anſwer me directly. I am a plain man, and love plain dealing. Was Jeſus the Son of God

and

and Saviour of mankind beleeved any other-wayes to be true and really God after that Councel had declared him to be consubstantial to Almighty God his heavenly Father, than he was before Christians ever heard of that word Consubstantiality or *Consubstantiation*? If Christians notwithstanding that new word still beleeved and adhered to one and the same old faith they did before, then say I the same of Transubstantiation. And if that new word made no new article, no more does this: Nor doth the one word any more belong to Christian Religion than the other: and both indeed only so far, as they conveigh the old faith, by this new invented word, guarded against the subtilties of the hereticks then living, who by their circumventing sophistry deluded all other expressions concerning the real presence of the Godhead in our Lords humanity, and of his humanity in the Eucharist, save only that other of *Consubstantiation*, and this of *Transubstantiation*, both words in those dayes equally new. And when those heresies and hereticks are once vanished, ther is no further use of the words amongst Christians, who beleev and worship by vertue of their Christian Tradition, the very thing it self, Gods divinity in his humanity, and Christs humanity in his sacred Eucharist, without troubling their heads with those hard words, which were invented against

subtil

ſubtil hereticks, unleſs haply the ſame hereſies ſhould riſe again. And the Catholik flock acts and beleevs after both thoſe Councels, juſt as their Chriſtian predeceſſours did before. They acknowledg Chriſt our Lord really God, and fear, and love, and hope in him, whether they ever hear of his conſubſtantiality or conſubſtantiation with God, or no. Nor do they ever trouble their heads to know, what is the meaning of *con*, or what is *ſubſtance*; or what be *accidents*, or what *ſubſtantiation*, or *conſubſtantiation*, no more after that Councel of Nice than before it. Such terms and phraſes are beſides the ſimplicity of their holy and innocent beleef, which holds notwithſtanding all that is really meant by thoſe words, taught them in a more natural and plainer way. So likewiſe do Catholik beleevers after the Councel of Lateran worſhip their crucified Redeemer in the Euchariſt, in the ſame manner others did before it, being the very ſame Chriſtians with thoſe that lived the age before, and think no more of Tranſubſtantiation many thouſands of theſe now, then thoſe others did: that word making no more difference before and after this Councel of Lateran, then had *Conſubſtantiation* made amongſt the Catholik Chriſtians, which were before and after that other Councel of Nice. By thoſe words ſom cunning wolves had been by their Paſtours diſcovered and ſeparated from the

ſheep;

sheep; and after that the whole flock fed quietly in the same hills, and by the same fountains they did before. And in this sence Catholik Divines might say, and truly say, that Transubstantiation is not of faith either before the Councel or after, if any one of them did indeed ever say so. For Christian faith is not words, as I said before, nor words any Religion.

And if those Catholik Divines, who ever they were, meant any thing else; as namely, that the Christians before that Councel of Lateran, who indeed worshipped their Redeemer in the Eucharist as true and fully as any that lived after that Councel ever did or can, were not given generally to understand explicitely, that Christ our Lord is so present in the Eucharist, that ther is there no other substance but himself: in this sence they spoke true, that so much had not been spoken expressly by a Councel, but yet that the faith and practice of Christians both before and after that Councel was the same. And so consequently ther was no more of faith after that Councel than was before it; whether we consider the learned or the common flock of Christians. For these worship Christ in the Eucharist after that Councel, as others did before it; though neither of them think of *Transubstantiation*: and those learned ones spake and wrote of our Lords presence in the Eucharist before that Councel,

as

as others do after it: and both do equally believe the thing that is meant by *Transſubſtantiation*, which in a diverſe ſence, according as men ſpeak either of the word or meaning of the word, may be either ſaid to be or not to be of faith, either before the Lateran Councel or after it. Thoſe words of Tertullian in his 2. *book ad uxorem*, where he ſpeaks of the marriage of a Gentile with a Chriſtian woman, *Non ſciet maritus, quid ſecretò ante omnem cibum guſtet, & ſi ſciverit, panem non illum credat eſſe qui dicitur, &c.* Thoſe alſo of S. Cyprian in his *Cœna Domini*, *Panis iſte communis in carnem & ſanguinem mutatus*, &c. And again; *Panis iſte non in ſpecie ſed naturâ mutatur*, &c. Thoſe likewiſe of St. Chryſoſtom, *de pœnitent ſerm. 5. Non quod panis ſit reſpicias, neq; quod vinum ſit reputes*, &c. And again; *Myſteria hic conſumi Chriſti corporis ſubſtantiâ, &c.* Thoſe too of S. Greg. Nyſſen in his *magna Catechiſta. Rectè ergo nunc quoq; Dei verbo ſanctificatum panem, εἰς σῶμα τῦ θεῦ λόγυ μεταποιεῖσθαι πιςύομεν*: and again; *Hæc autem dat virtute benedictionis, in illud tranſelementatâ eorum quæ apparent naturâ.* Laſtly, (that I may not forget my own deſign, which is not here to prove Catholik faith, but only to take a little view of this Diſſwaſive from it) thoſe words of S. Cyril in his *Myſtagogica quarta*; *Hoc ſciens & pro certiſſimo habens panem hunc qui, videtur à nobis non eſſe panem, etiamſi guſtus panem*

eſſe

esse sentiat, sed corpus Christi; & vinum quod à nobis conspicitur, tametsi & sensu gustus vinum esse videatur, non tamen vinum, sed sanguinem esse Christi, &c. I say these and such like words of ancient Christian Divines, many hundreds of years before the Councel of Lateran, speak as much the thing meant by *Transubstantiation*, as any Doctour can express it now; though these may know more of the word than they. And indeed the definition of the Catholik Councel makes no alteration at all in the practice of Catholik faith, which so considers their Lords presence in the Eucharist, that it never heeds the *Quomodo* or concomitances; the adoration, love, and devotion being still and ever in all things the very same.

If Christ our Lord should appear to two Christians now, as he did once to S. Paul in a splendour of light; and a voice out of that shining brightnes should issue so efficacious, that they should both of them be fully perswaded in their hearts to worship him whom they beleeved both of them there present. I suppose these two would equally do well, and equally do the same thing, although one of them should haply think ther was no other thing there, but his Lord in an appearance of light, and the other should not think at all of the light, whether it were a substance or only an appearance of it. But if a third man should deny the real presence

of

of our Lord in that light, he would for certain be of another faith. So it is here, Protestants who deny the real presence, are of another beleef from Catholiks who acknowledg it; but Catholiks who equally adore it, are all of one beleef, though perhaps not one of a million ever thinks of *Transubstantiation*. *O but Christ might be present in the Eucharist, although Transubstantiation were not.* He might so: and Christ likewise may be owned for God, though *Consubstantiation* were never thought of. Both there and here somthing is explicately spoken, which was latitant in the former practice and beleef, and he that can may understand it. But the millions that never heard of it, so long as they beleev and worship their Crucified Redeemer, as they ought, in the Eucharist, are never the worse. Had it not been for hereticks, neither Consubstantiation, nor Transubstantiation had been ever heard of: and yet the practice and faith of Catholik Christians the same it is.

The holy Fathers which your Disswader cites against this particle of Catholik beleef, som say nothing at all there concerning that thing, som speak what he cites in another manner, som teach quite contrary. But this I intend not now to insist upon. Only thus much in general, and I pray you, Sir, mark it well. Those ancient Fathers, who say somtimes, that the words of our Lord are to be understood *spiri-*

tually

tually not *carnally*; and that those symbols are a *figure* of his body, agree with all Catholiks that are now in the world no less in the meaning of those their words, than others wherin they manifestly assert the real presence in this Sacrament. For all Catholiks say, that our Lord is not to be so understood, that his holy body in the Eucharist is to be fed upon in a carnal way, as though it should be divided into gobbets, and so digested by the stomack into flesh and blood, as other meats are: but that as that holy body now glorified is becom a spiritual body, as good S. Paul speaks, totally spiritual and divine, and not now subject to any condition or laws of material corruptible bodies here on earth, so is it spiritually to be taken, as the food not of a mortal body, but the immortal spirit. So likewise do all Catholiks acknowledg and beleev that the symbols after the powerfull blessing of Christs consecration, do so becom his sacred body, by conversion, mutation, or transelementation, as the same Fathers speak; that the outward *appearance* which remains of them is not now any more a *figure* of bread and wine as it was before, but of our Lords precious body and blood which have succeeded in their place. So that those very words of the ancient Fathers, wherin they say, that the elements are now becom a *figure* of Christs body and blood, do prove not only a real presence,

but

but a tranſelementation too, or Tranſubſtantiation, which your Diſſwader judges to ſound ſomwhat more. For every material body (I pray you Sir mark this well) I ſay every material body here on earth, as a tree, a man, or beaſt, or other thing exhibits to the eye, ear, taſte, or other ſences an outward *ſpecies* of that which it is. And the ſubſtance ever goes along in nature with that appearance it exhibits, unleſs the power of God ſhould interpoſe, and make it otherwiſe. Thus when I have bread before me, or milk for example, that I ſee taken from the cow, I ſee it, and feel it, and taſt it, to be ſuch as it ſhows it ſelf; and ſuch it is as it ſhows it ſelf to be. Thus it is in all nature. But we are not, ſay thoſe good holy Fathers, to think ſo here. For though here be the colour and touch and taſt of bread; yet after this ſtrange and powerful converſion made by Gods omnipotent words, it is no more bread you ſee, it is not natural bread you touch, it is not material bread you taſt, but the bleſſed body of your Redeemer which is touched, ſeen, and taſted under thoſe remaining appearances, which are no more now the *figure* of bread, which they were before, but the *figure* of our Lords body under the ſpecies, appearance or repreſentation of bread now wonderfully concealed. And thus much is manifeſtly and clearly expreſt by all thoſe holy Fathers. *Hoc ſciens*, ſaith great

St.

St. Cyril of Jeruſalem, *& pro certiſſimo habens panem hunc qui videtur à nobis, non eſſe panem, etiamſi guſtus panem eſſe ſentiat, ſed eſt Corpus Chriſti: & vinum quod à nobis conficitur, tametſi & ſenſu guſtus vinum eſſe videatur, non tamen vinum, ſed ſanguinem eſſe Chriſti.* And this ſpeak all holy Fathers, both Greek and Latin. It would be endles to bring their teſtimonies. By theſe few words, if, Sir, you have heeded them well, you will preſently conceiv the meaning of that ſpeech of Tertullian in his third book againſt Marcion. *Acceptum panem & diſtributum diſcipulis Corpus ſuum illum fecit, Hoc eſt corpus meum dicendo, id eſt, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuiſſet, niſi veritatis eſſet Corpus. Caterum vacua res quod eſt phantaſma figuram capere non poſſet*, &c. And Miniſters are groſly deceived to think the Fathers ſpeak of a *figure* or *trope* in Rhetorick, it is manifeſtly apparent they ſpeak of a figure in nature, that figure or ſhape, which accompanies natural things, which in this myſterious Sacrament is made by the power of God to accompany another ſubſtance. So that here the appearance of natural bread is no more the *figure* of bread, as naturally it is, but the figure now of our Lords bleſſed body, touched by the power of God under that appearance, which is naturally the figure of wine and bread. And a figure of the body it could not be, unleſs the ſubſtance of that body were

really and truly there under that figure or appearance, *Figura non fuisset, nisi veritas esset corpus.*

But in Peter Lumbards time, Transubstantiation was so far from being an article of Catholik faith, that they did not know whether it were true or no, as appears by the same authour in his 4. book and eleventh distinction: so that it made haste to past in the Later an Councel for faith, which about fifty years before, in Lumbards time, was but a new disputable opinion. Your Disswader had done wisely, if he had produced for himself, as frequently he does, only some obscure authours, which seldom fall into mens hands. But Peter Lumbard the master of sentences, is an authour so known by all, and in every mans hand, that your Disswader, had he not utterly abandoned both honesty and reason too, had never mentioned him. For this great master from his eight to the fourteen distinction of his fourth book, doth with all solidity and art, so declare and confirm the real presence in this Sacrament of the Altar, and the conversion of the elements by Gods powerful word into the very substance of our Lords body, as a great article of ancient Christian faith, that nothing can be said either more solidly, or with more earnest resolution. But, *Quem Deus vult perdere, dementat.* After your Disswader had wilfully thrown away his honesty, God in his just judgment so darkened his

his reason, that he could not so much as heed what he said. There I say that learned Catholik Doctour does industriously and in a copious manner in thirty whole pages together according to the edition I have by me, printed at Colen, both declare and establish that Catholik Christianity of the real presence, and transmutation of the elements into Christs sacred body, answering and clearing many things which hereticks and pagan philosophers might object against it. And your Disswader takes hold of one of the philosophical objections, which the great master presently solves, for an argument of the masters own doubting; although he could not but see him assert, declare and establish the contrary, the real presence I mean, and miraculous mutation of the elements into the substance of our Lords flesh and blood, in all that his copious and learned discours, both before and after that objection. O unhappy Kingdom of ours, by these lying fals teachers so wofully misled. This one only passage, which any one that hath but a mediocrity of learning may see with his own eyes, may suffice to show what a man your Disswader is, and how little to be credited. But whom God will overthrow for his grand misdemeanours, him he in his justice blindeth. I could find in my heart to give here an abridgment of all that great masters discours concerning this Sacrament of the altar, as he

there calls it. But it is somwhat besides my way, and I have already been too long. *Qui legit intelligat.*

The great weight and importance of this busines hath made me speak somthing more of it, than I shall of other things. That I may therfor here recapitulate in brief, what I have hitherto said to manifest your Disswaders insignificancy, and to speak plainly, his impertinency in this point: First he is faulty, in that he never declares this busines of Transubstantiation, what it is, or what it means in the belief and judgment of that Roman Church he opposes: Secondly, that he makes all the Popish Doctours which he mentions concerning it, to speak against it, and to disown it, whatever he meant by it, and not any one of them to speak for it, or profes it. And how then is it Popish or Popery. Thirdly, that he sayes in the beginning of his section, that *the piece of Popery he here writes against was first determined in the Councel of Lateran*, and yet but two pages after, forgetting himself, he sayes, *that the opinion was not determined in the Lateran, as it is now held in Rome*: and yet never expresses how it is now held in Rome, or what that is which is now held in Rome contrary to the Councel, or by whom, or in what manner. Fourthly, becaus the busines of the *real Presence*, which Protestants love to call Transubstantiation, that they

may

may play with that fine long gingling word, as children with a rattle, is not touched at all by him. And yet that is all the substance of Popery in this point: which, that Berengarius the heretick, together with his associates might fully acknowledg without any slight of the manifold evasions used by him, this word was invented by the Prelates of the Councel, as was Consubstantiation by those of Nice, for a firmer establishment of Catholick Tradition, and ancient truth. So that your Dissuader here touches but the lid and rind, not the heart and substance of Popery, which he is afraid indeed to deal with. And being weak in sence, he playes with words.

§. 6. *Which is against Popish Communion.*

"Sayes, that the half-communion is another "Innovation in Popery, swerving from the "Apostles practice, and Christs Institution: "as appears in the Popish Councel of Con- "stance, where it is decreed, though Christ in- "stituted, and primitive Christians received in "both kinds, yet that no Priest under pain of "Excommunication should communicate the "people under both kinds, which is a bold af- "front to Christ himself: although even their "own Cassander and Aquinas teach, that to be "the ancient custom of the Church, and Pas- "chasius resolves it dogmatically, that the one "is not to be communicated without the other.

This busines, Sir, is more amply discussed and cleared in my *Fiat Lux*, which you have by you. If you do but read that, I shall have here less to say. But know Sir, that this busines touches not any unalterable dogme of faith, but an alterable use and practice, as shall be declared by and by: and therfor is it not to be called Popery, upon that account. And a change in such things is so far from blame, that it is oftentimes necessary; so long as the substance of Religion is preserved intire, as here it is. Christians are to fast after the departure of the Espouse: and set times therfor to be appointed, that such a good work be not in the Church of God utterly neglected: yet the dayes and times are some of them for urgent reasons altered. They did fast on Wednesdayes and not Saturdayes in many places; now on Saturdayes not Wednesdayes. Christians did stand at their Liturgy all Paschall time; now they kneel. Little children were in old time communicated after Baptisme in many places of the Catholik world; now no where. Absolution is now given upon an humble confession and a promis either expreſt or tacite of performing the due pennance; but it could not be in ancient times obtained, till the pennance was fulfilled. Priests may be consecrated now at twenty five years old; in former times not till thirty. Many holy dayes were then kept, which now cannot: Many now,

which

which could not then. Communion was oftner in som ages, than it is now. There is a reason for all these changes of discipiin and custom. But the substance of Religion remains ever the same, about Fasts, Liturgy, Baptism, Pennance, Confession, Priesthood, Feasts, Communion, and such like things, though som circumstance may change. So concerning this point of the Eucharist the substance of Religion is, that in memory of our blessed Lords Passion, a benediction or consecration of bread and wine be made in the Church of God by his Priests for ever, until our Lords second coming: to the end that the Church his spouse may ever have his body with her to feed upon. This I say is the substance of religion in this point. But som circumstances, such as may, will change. For example, Priests rarely celebrated in som times of the Church, but yet when any Mass or Messach was kept by any one of them, all the other Priests and Clergy-men that were near would assuredly be present at it, and hear and pray, and meditate with other people in most humble and fervent manner, as became all good Christians to do: but now in this last age they go generally every one to the Altar daily. Which custom is the better, I will not here determin. But I am sure, that great S. Francis commanded all his children to hear Mass once a day both Priests and others; but forbad those that were

Prieſts every day to celebrate: and I think he had the Spirit of God in him. In old times all Chriſtian Prieſts had their head covered at the Altar with an *Amictus* or amice of pure linnen, now they generally let it fall into their neck, and their heads are utterly bare. And time will come, that they will put it upon their heads again. So likewiſe for good and juſt reaſons, were catholik people in ſom times and places communicated in the one kind, and ſom time in the other, and ſom time and place in both. But they were never debard Communion; nor was ever the Sacrifice of the Altar ſtopped. Nor is it ſo indifferent a circumſtance to conſecrate or celebrate in one kind, as it is in one kind to communicate. For Communion reſpects the thing contained, the body and blood of Chriſt, which was ever beleeved to be equally preſent in either kind. But the ſacrifice or conſecration in one kind would not figure our Lords death and paſſion, and the effuſion of his blood, as it ought to do. But this great Chriſtian work of ſacrificing, which is eſſential Religion, and the very characteriſtical badg of Chriſtianity, becaus our Proteſtant Reformers caſt it off, they talk ever ſince, only of Communion of lay-people, as though the ſacred benediction, or conſecration and oblation, which indeed is the Chriſtian ſacrifice according to the rite and figure of Melchiſedek, recounted, admired, and worſhipped by all primitive

mitive Christians, were instituted only for that end. Wheras indeed Christ our Lords institution touches immediately the figuration only of his death and passion, which is completly don in the sacrifice consummated by the Priest; although the peoples communion, unto whose comfort and benefit all that work of consecration is exercised in the Church, ought to follow by sequel, when it is necessary or expedient.

Now the ancient primitive Church so firmly beleeved, that the blessed body and blood, and whole humanity and divinity of Christ, were so present to those sacred symbols after the benediction or consecration of them by their Priests in Christs name and vertue, tho it be unconceivable and wholly ineffable unto us: that if a man with an indifferent and unprejudiced eye will but look back upon antiquity, he may plainly see, that in all ages it was indifferent to Christians, though not to consecrate, yet to communicate either in one kind or both. For the younger people, and such as were sick, were generally communicated only in the liquid kind; and others, though som also received in both when solemn Communion was made, yet that in the very primitive times, they thought it all one to receiv either in both or one, S. Cyprian, S. Basil, and Tertullian, very ancient Priests and Fathers do abundantly witness. For Tertullian in his book *de oratione*, describing the Christian

wayes of old. *Usque adeo accepto corpore*, saith he, *stationem liceret solvere*: that is, when they had communicated the body of their Lord, no mention made of the chalice, they brake up their station, and had their *Ite missa est*, to be gon; as it is now even at this day among Catholiks. And as for S. Basil, he in his epistle to Cæsarea Patricia, tells at large how Christians in those dayes communicated four times a week and oftner, if a Martyrs feast chanced to fall in the week: and how, that if persecution happened so violent, that a Priest could not be had to give the people Communion, they were forced with their own hands to touch that sacred body, which was consecrated and kept in *ciborium's*, boxes or pixis for them. And this the peoples irreverence of touching the sacred body, good S. Basil labours to excuse, both by the urgency of their devotion and need; and also by the example of the Hermits, who leading a monastical life, for want of Priests at that time among them, kept the sacred Communion in their cells, and received it with their own hands, touching it, contrary to the general custom, when devotion and piety required: as also by that of the Christians in Alexandria, and Egypt, who in such times of persecution and danger, would have the sacred Communion at home in their own houses, lest upon any necessity they should chance to dye without it: and lastly by the very

custom

cuſtom of Prieſts in the Church, who then ſo delivered the hoſt to communicants, that when it was put by the Prieſts into their mouths, they touched ſom part of it, who received it, with their own hands. All this S. Baſil there diſcourſes more at large: which agree well to the conſecrated bread, thus touched by the people in time of neceſſity, thus put into their mouths by the help of the Prieſts and their own hands, thus kept at home in times of perſecution, thus reſerved in pixes or little arks, but not at all to the chalice And all thoſe devout Chriſtians, thought themſelves ſufficiently communicated in one kind, who underſtood Chriſtianity as well ſurely, as we do now abov a thouſand years after them. St. Cyprian likewiſe in his book *de lapſis*, has much to the ſame purpos, giving us alſo to underſtand by his teſtimony, that thoſe ancient Chriſtians for fear of death, and the grievances of perſecution, had uſually the Sacrament kept by them in a Repoſitory or Ark in their houſes, which with all devout reverence when they were neceſſitated to it, they put with their own hands into their mouths, and participated on ſuch like occaſion, although by general cuſtom it uſed to be put into their mouths by the hands of Prieſts. And he relates amongſt other things a frightful ſtory of a certain woman, who for fear or other weaknes had complied to the idol ſacrifices: and when ſhe came home, to repent

and

and humble her self in her Oratory, and by holy communion both to expiate that her transgression, and strengthen her against the like temptation, as soon as she had opened her *Ciborium* or *Pixis*, wherein the body of her Lord and Redeemer was kept, a terrible flash of fire issuing thence upon her, did so affright her, that she durst not touch it. *Quandam*, saith he, *mulierem sacrificiis idolorum contaminatam, cum Repositorium seu Arcam suam, in quâ sanctum Domini posuerat, manibus pollutis tentasset aperire, ignis efflans eam terruit, nec tangere erat ausa.* This and much more might be brought to witnes, that primitive Christians thought themselves completly communicated in one kind, and this very kind that is now in use amongst Catholiks. But I must come to your Doctour.

Half-Communion, saith he, *is another Popish novelty, wherby they deprive the people of Christs blood.* Sir, if they eat in memory that Christ died for them, which they do, and which in all Protestancy makes a perfect communion, how are they deprived of his blood. Can they beleev his death and passion without faith of his blood shed for them? *But they ought to have wine as well as bread.* So they have: as much as the Disswader and his Church allows their people, wherby they may *feed upon Christ*, who shed his blood for us, *in their heart by faith with thanksgiving*; and which as your Disswader here speaks,

ſpeaks, may make Chriſts body and blood preſent to them *by ſacramental conſequence.* And how is it then a half-communion? *O but the wine is not the blood of Chriſt.* Not carnally as your Diſſwader ſpeaks of his Sacrament, but it is ſo by ſacramental conſeqence. It is as much then as yours the blood of Chriſt. And how is it then a half-communion, and yours a whole one? *O but their bread is beleeved to be the body of Chriſt.* So it is: but yours is not. And therfor if theirs be but a half-communion, yours is none at all. But how good Doctour *Diſſwaſive* is half-communion either new Popery, or old Popery, or any Popery at all? Roman Catholiks or Papiſts uſe no ſuch word: nor do they own any ſuch thing as *Half-Communion.* They beleev and call it a whole Communion. Is it lawful for you to forge a Popery of your own, and then put it upon them, who neither in thought, word, or any of their writings profeſs any ſuch thing. *But is not Communion in one kind all one with Half-Communion?* No, Sir, it is not all one. It differs as much as half and whole. And that I think is ſomthing. It is a whole Communion Sir, both in the tenour of their beleef, and according to that of yours. And why then ſhould you call it a *half-communion?* According to theirs, whole Chriſt is equally preſent under either of thoſe figures or appearances: and therfor according to their faith

faith it is a whole Communion. And according to yours it is no leſs. When you your ſelves give the bread to your people, and ſay, *Take this in remembrance that Chriſt died for thee, and feed upon him in thy heart by faith with thankſgiving*, you do not intend I ſuppoſe, nor do the people mean to feed only upon one half of him. Why then would your Diſſwader injuriouſly miſname that a half-communion, which in all opinions is a whole one. Neither Catholiks nor Proteſtants feed upon the ſigns but thing ſignified. This difference too there is, that Catholiks have all the myſtery of the paſſion repreſented to them in their ſacrifice, and the preſence of the whole Lord in their Communion. But Proteſtants have no ſuch thing: although the myſtery be preacht to them. And therfor is the Catholik not a half but whole Communion; and that of the Proteſtants may well be doubted, whether it be any Communion at all, though it be a whole Sermon. For how can any one diſcern the Lords body there, where in reality it is not? If your Diſſwader had a candour becoming a gentleman, he would neither falſifie the wayes, nor miſname the practice of any Religion. But be it as it is. Since Papiſts, as he will have them called, have equally uſed the Communion in the liquid kind alone, as this in only the other, why ſhould he call one of them more than the other by the name of Popery.

And

And why is not Communion in both kinds, which he acknowledges to have been more in use amongst them, and proves it by the testimony of their own popish doctours, be rather Popery than either of the other. *O but this half-communion began but in the Councel of Constance.* I have sufficiently shown you, Sir, that the custom was in the world, before the City of Constance knew what Christianity were.

And even this Councel of Constance is perverted by the Dissuader too: as if he had sworn to act nothing sincerely. That busines in the Councel was thus. Petrus Dresdensis, and other associates of Huz, had taught publickly, and with much scandal, that the Eucharist is necessarily to be given to lay-people after supper, and in both kinds. This doctrin and practice of theirs was censured by the Councel, which at one and the same time declared those two circumstances of communicating in both kinds and after supper, not to be of necessary obligation; because the Canons and approved ancient custom of the Church, had never looked upon those two circumstances, as of necessity to be observed. But what does your Dissuader here? First he sets down the Councels resolution in direct opposition to Christ. *Whereas Christ instituted, &c. yet we command contrary, &c.* as though the Councel had absolutely annulled Christs institution: which notwithstanding

ſtanding they acknowledg and allow for good; and only declare the two ſaid circumſtances in that inſtitution of our Lord, not to be of that neceſſity as the ſubſtance of the inſtitution it ſelf, giving for their reaſon for it, which your Diſſwader thinks not good to take notice of, that the Canons and ancient cuſtom of the Church had ſufficiently made manifeſt, that thoſe two circumſtances of communicating at night and in both kinds were not neceſſary, by allowing the contrary practice in primitive times. Secondly, whereas the Councel joyned both the circumſtances together, namely of communicating in both kinds and after ſupper, he quite leaves out that of receiving after ſupper: becaus it would as much have inferred the Proteſtant practice to be againſt Chriſts inſtitution as the Popiſh is: and ſo his talk would either have been of no value, or againſt himſelf. Thirdly, whereas the Councel declared only againſt the opinion which thoſe Hereticks had of the neceſſity of thoſe two circumſtances, and correſponding practice, he makes them to condemn not their neceſſity, but the circumſtances themſelves, which the Councel never thought of. Fourthly, he delivers that Councels declaration againſt thoſe circumſtances, as if it had been a dogme of faith, and conſequently Popery or Catholik Religion, wheras it was delivered in order to the circumſtances

them-

themselves but as a temporal law and decree, though in order to the necessity of those circumstances it be a constant Catholik truth. And therfor the Councel of Basil, which a little after determined the same doctrin, namely that Priests are not bound to communicate the people in both kinds, whereof they also give their reason, *quia certa fide tenendum est, quod sub specie panis non tantum caro, & sub specie vini non sanguis tantùm, sed sub qualibet specie Christus totus continetur, sess.* 30; yet they allowed the Bohemians and Moravians, who desiring to submit to the Catholik Church, and yet in their weaknes could not comply with that custom, to be communicated in both kinds. These four are shifts of much infincerity, but I must beat with him. His other authorities against this Catholik custom now generally in use, may be easily understood by what I have hitherto spoken what they mean. But that of Paschasius I cannot but give you notice of it. For Paschasius speaking of one certain ceremony in the Priests celebration of Mass, wherin he drops a piece of the host into the consecrated chalice. *Very rightly*, saith he, *is the flesh sociated with the blood, becaus neither the flesh without the blood, &c.* And a little after, *Therfor*, saith he, *they are well put together in the chalice, becaus from one cup of Christs Passion, &c.* From those words, which speak only the Priests action in

the sacrifice of Mass, your Protestant Dissuader would prove his communion of people in both kinds, of which Paschasius neither spoke nor thought. Is he not hard put to it think you? or is he ignorant rather of what he speaks. But he is gon to his next section, and I must follow him.

§. 7. *Which is against Service in an unknown Tongue.*

"Sayes, that the Roman Church offends no "less in another of their Novelties, of using an "unknown tongue in their Service; which use "can no more be reconciled with Saint Pauls "fourteenth chapter to the Corinthians, than "adultery with the seventh Commandment: "and Origen, Ambrose, Basil, Chrysostom, "Austin, Aquinas also and Lyra speak all a-"gainst it: no less also the Civil and Canon "Law. Indeed what profit can he receiv, who "hears a sound and understands it not: a dumb "Priest would serve as well: for God under-"stands his thoughts. The popish people that "pray in their churches they know not what, can "have no affection, becaus they have no under-"standing of their own prayers. Therfore let "every tongue prais the Lord.

Here the Dissuader, that he may the better expres the confusion and darknes that is in this popish custom, which he means here to speak against, uses a confused and dark speech

of

of his own, and confutes it rather by emblem than reason. His reader no doubt will imagin, or els the Disswader fails of his end, that Roman Catholiks *do not understand their own prayers in the Church*; that *God is not praised by them in every tongue*; that *they are not at all edified by their Liturgy or Mass*; that *they joyn not their desires, nor understand what they say or ask of God*; that *their heart sayes nothing nor asks for nothing, and therfor receivs nothing*; that *they understand not in particular, what they should desire or beg of God*; that *their own souls have not any benefit by their prayers*; and that *the Church will not suffer them to be brought out of their intollerable ignorance*. All these things are jumblingly said and asserted in this his section against the Roman liturgy, & must as he hopes be beleeved by his reader. But ther is not a Roman catholik in the world, however ignorant and simple he be, but will be ready to tell your Disswader to his face, that ther is not of all this, any one word of it true. But he imagines that Roman Catholiks come to Church like Protestants, there standing or sitting, and looking upon one another, till a black-coat comes to read som prayers in their ears. But in this he is grosly mistaken, as all Catholiks know, though others do not. They have their obsecrations, their meditations, their postulations, their psalms, their ejaculations, which humbly upon their knees they

pour forth to their Redeemer, both while their priest is with them at the altar; and before, and after too. Nor is there a blesseder sight to be seen on earth, than devout Catholicks in a Church; wheras others stand or sit, gazing about, till the *Parson* comes to make use of their ears, neither heart, nor lip, nor hand, nor knee, nor breast being to them of any use. And this every one would understand as well as I, if he understood Catholik customs and religion as I do. Nor does the Priest come to the altar to teach the people what they should say, but to pray and make an atonement for them. And in his confession, entrance, hymn of *glory to God on high*, prayer, epistle and gospel, and his whole work of consecration and offering, they go along with him in their meditations, humiliations and requests, understanding all the whole matter and busines of that heavenly devotion, though they hear not his particular words, which it would be all one to them, whether they were in latin or in the mother tongue. I know alas, I speak but in vain, to such as are brought up in another way, and by fallacious slights of ministers are lead into a misconceit of the ancient religion of this Land; which till they see it again, they can hardly ever rightly understand. Prejudice is a lettance almost unremovable. And it concerns ministers, that such a prejudice should be continually riveted into

into peoples minds, who must either be deceiyed, or ministers undone. But he that sees Catholik people at their devotions, and Protestants at theirs, would, if he be any wayes disinteressted, conclude with himself, that Catholik people serv God in earnest, Protestants but in jeast.

Truth is, the Catholik Liturgy is only a representation of Christs death and passion, which our Lord appointed should be exhibited to the eyes of his beleevers, so long as the world shall last: that coming still together, they may worship there their crucified Lord, and pour forth in him all their requests, every one according to their several necessities. So that the priest and peoples great work is soon ended; the consecration, lifting up the host and chalice, and adoration, being all accomplished in half a quarter of an hour: and in som Churches, that especially of Ethiopia, in yet lesser time. And all the prayers and meditations, and what other things the Priest either speaks with his lips or heart besides, are only to dispose himself, before and after that great work. And in all times have Christian people ever made it their special care, to furnish themselvs with such meditations and affections, as that their solemn work of adoration requires. I find in my heart here to set down the way I have been taught to hear Mass, and which I

practise my self. Such an ocular pattern would I am sure give more satisfaction to my countrymen, than any general words I can speak concerning it. But I shall have som better place for that hereafter.

The testimony of authorities which your Disswader brings against this Roman custom of one and the same language all over the world, which he calls an unknown tongue, either speak nothing at all to that busines, or say nothing but what Papists say themselves; and many of them by his usual trick either of total falsity, or partial depravation, are made by your Disswader to speak against a custom, which they never so much as dreamed to impugn. If Origen say, that the *Grecians in their prayers use Greek, and the Romans the Roman language, &c.* so say all Papists too. The Maronites with some others use the Hebrew Liturgy, Grecians the Greek, and Western Christians the Roman; and so every one in his own tongue, that is proper to that part of the Church wherof he is a member, prayeth and praiseth God. And yet it was never thought necessary that any people in the Christian world should have their Liturgy in their mother tongue. Again, if St. Ambrose say, *when people meet for edification in the Church, things ought to be spoken which hearers understand:* so say, and so do Papists also. For all their Sermons, which are made for edification, are ever

in

in the mother tongue, or vulgar language of the Countrey; and in so plain a manner they either are or should be uttered, that hearers may understand and edifie thereby. But the Christian sacrifice is offered up to God, not for the peoples edification or instruction, but for their reconciliation and peace. Likewise if S. Jerom and Ulphilas *translated the Bible:* so has it been translated by several other Priests since their time, I beleev into all languages of the world, and is continually read and expounded in Catholik Countreys, now one mystery of it, then another, unto peoples constant edification. But this infers not that it ever was or ought to be read in the Churches, one chapter after another, instead of their Liturgy. No such thing did antiquity ever hear of. If the civil law of Justinian ordain *all byshops and Priests to celebrate the sacred oblation not in a low voice, but with a loud clear voice, which may be heard by people:* so do Roman Priests at this day act all according to that Canon. But how came the first reforming Protestants to leave off the name of Priests, but only becaus they had no such sacred oblation, which was abolished by them, any longer now to make. Again, if there issued from Pope Innocent the third, a precept or decree in the Councel of Lateran, *that in the same city,* as your Dissuader here speaks, thinking it I beleev to be som City called Lateran, *where people*

had then met together from several parts of the world, service should be celebrated according to the diversity of ceremonies and languages; no doubt but that precept or decree was then observed throughout all the City of Rome, where that Councel was kept. And the Maronites with their adherents, had the sacred Liturgy in Chaldee or Hebrew, the Grecians in Greek, others in Latin, with such variety of ceremonies therin, as was used in these several nations, though they acted the same thing in substance. So that such as came from Syria, Egypt, or Greece, were not bound to be present at the Latin Liturgy, although they were then in Rome; nor yet the Romans to the Hebrew or Greek Mass. And if any were met there from our English Sarum Church, they might use their Sarum Missal, and not that of the Roman Dioces, although it might have shorter, or perhaps longer graduals, more or fewer meditations, or differing evangiles, or a longer solemnity of consecration. This difference is still in the world amongst Roman Catholiks at this day, and ever was and will be, although the whole substance of their Messach or Liturgy be every where the same. And for this reason a Dominican Fryar, now deceased, coming over some years ago into England, becaus he began his Mass with *Confitemini Domino*, after the manner of the Dominicans, and not with the

usual

usual psalm, *Judica me Deus*; although they had patience with him till he had ended, yet the women that were present at it, got together afterwards, and in their indiscreet zeal fell upon him, and beat him for a counterfeit. And if the Councel be of any force here, (otherwise why is it brought) then are Catholiks according to that Councel to celebrate in the very same city here with Protestants without controul, though they use diversity of ceremonies and languages. All these authorities then, make nothing against this piece of Popery, but rather confirm it. And the glosses which your Disswader makes upon them, and all his insulting invectives, are but the froth of his own evil will.

When your Disswader tells us further, that Basil, Chrysostome, Ambrose, Austin, Aquinas and Lyra speak against Service in an unknown tongue, as unapt to edifie; the aforenamed Catholik Gentlemen, who have endeavoured with all care to search the Libraries for a trial of your Disswaders honesty, have found in som of those Fathers no such book as your Disswader cites, and in none of them any such words. Which I am apt to beleev, not only by reason of the industrious sincerity of the said Gentlemen, and palpable insincerity of this Disswader, but for other special reasons drawn from the authors themselves. For St. Basil and St. Chrysostome, St. Austin and St. Ambrose, the

two

two first were Greek Priests that used a Greek Liturgy of their own, one of them an Archbishop or Patriarch, the other a monk; the two last, S. Ambrose a Priest and Bishop of Millain in Italy, S. Austin the like in Africa, and founder of the Augustin Canons regulars, and Hermits, used a Latin one: both which differed even in their times from the vulgar language of their respective places. And Aquinas and Lyra are manifestly known to be later popish Priests and Friars, using one and the same Latin Liturgy, differing from the languages of England and Spain. As also becaus it is unlikely, they would use this Disswaders reason, *becaus such unknown tongues in the liturgy would not edifie.* For though edification in a large sence may well agree with the Mass or Liturgy; in that, it excites holy and heavenly affections; yet in its proper sence it is the effect of sermons and good preachers, edifying the people by their holy lives and wholsom doctrin, unto an emulation and care of observing what those people see and hear so frequently taught and practised by their pious preachers.

Those words of S. Chrysostom, *If one speak in an unknown tongue, he is a barbarian to himself and others,* are absolutely true. For so, if an Embassadour, or any other here in England, should chatter words which neither himself nor

others

others understand, he would be a barbarian both to others and to himself too. But when your Disswader sayes, that S. Chrysostom spake so, *in order to a form of prayer, and urging the Apostles precept for it*, he wrongs him wretchedly. For he does it not; nor can such a saying have any place in such a business. For the priest speaks not in his liturgy to the people, as your Disswader simply imagines, but to God, where both speaker and hearer understand. But the testimony of Lyra who is made to say, that in the primitive Church *all things were done in a vulgar language*, is falsified in the very substance. For he sayes not *omnia* all things, but *communia* common things, some parts in Baptism, where the godfather or godmother makes a profession of faith; something in churchings of women, benedictions, marriages, and such like, as is yet in use amongst Papists at this day, were so done. So that all the contents of this section, the testimonies your Disswader brings against this Catholik custom, and your Disswaders own insultings, which I set down in the beginning, together with his glosses upon those testimonies, are either absolutely fals or totally impertinent, and in one word unconscionably slaunderous.

But *it is as possibly*, saith he, *to reconcile adultery with the seventh Commandment, as Church service in a language not understood, to the fourteenth*

teenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians. And is it so? Let us look then into that strange fourteenth Chapter; and see what it sayes.

1. *Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that you may prophesie.* 2. *For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God, for no man understandeth him: however in the spirit he speaketh mysteries.* 3. *But he that prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edification, exhortation, and comfort.* 4. *He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself: but he that prophesieth edifieth the Church.* 5. *I would that you all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret that the Church may receive edifying.* 6. *Now brethren if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you except I shall speak to you either by revelation or by knowledg, or by prophesying or by doctrin.* 7. *And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction of the sound, how shall it be known what is piped or harped.* 8. *For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle?* 9. *So likewise you, except you utter by the tongue words easie to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for he shall speak unto the air.* 10. *There are it may be so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them are without signification,*

cation. 11. Therfor if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me. 12. Even so ye forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excell to the edifying of the Church. 13. Wherefor let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue, pray that he may interpret. 14. For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayes, but my understanding is unfruitful. 15. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, I will pray with the understanding also. 16. Els when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen to thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? 17. For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified. 18. I thank my God I speak with tongues more than you all. 19. Yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. 20. Brethren, be not children in understanding, howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding men. 21. In the law it is written, with men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people: and yet for all that, will they not hear me saith the Lord. 22. Wherfore tongues are for a sign not to them that beleev, but to them that beleev not: but prophesying serveth not to them that beleev not, but to them who beleev. 23. If therfor the whole Church be come toge-

together in ſom place, and all ſpeak with tongues, and there come in thoſe that are unlearned or unbelevers, will they not ſay that ye are mad? 24. But if all propheſie, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all; he is judged of all. 25. And thus are the ſecrets of his heart made manifeſt, and ſo falling down on his face, he will worſhip God, and report that God is in you of a truth. 26. How is it then brethren, when ye come together, every one of you hath a pſalm, hath a doctrin, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation: let all things be done to ediſying. 27. If any man ſpeak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the moſt by three, and that by cours, and let one interpret. 28. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep ſilence in the Church, and let him ſpeak to himſelf and to God. 29. Let the prophets ſpeak two or three, and let the other judg. 30. And if any thing be revealed to another that ſitteth by, let the firſt hold his peace. 31. For ye may all propheſie one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted. 32. And the ſpirit of the prophets are ſubject to the prophets. 33. For God is not the author of confuſion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the Saints I teach. 34. Let your women keep ſilence in the Churches, for it is not permitted to them to ſpeak, but they are to be under obedience, as alſo ſaith the law. 35. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a ſhame

for

for a woman to speak in the Church. 36. *What, came the word of God out from you, or came it unto you only?* 37. *If any think himself a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledg that the things I write unto you are the commandments of God the Lord.* 38. *But if any be ignorant, let him be ignorant.* 39. *Wherfore brethren covet to propheſie, and forbid not to speak with tongues.* 40. *Let all things be done decently and in order.* Thus runs this fourteenth Chapter in your own tranſlation. And if it do nothing at all concern Church-ſervice, why ſhould the Roman Liturgy be reconciled to it, any more than adultery to the third commandment? Or what diſparagement is it to this ſervice, that it cannot be reconciled to that law which no way concerns it: If it do concern Church-ſervice, then muſt all the Common prayer and Service of our Proteſtant Church of England be aboliſhed; being as irreconcileable to this rule, as you ſay adultery is to the ſeventh Commandment. Say which you pleaſe. If it concern not any Church-ſervice, you juſtifie as to this account the cuſtom of the Roman Church: if you ſay it do, you condemn your own.

Truth is, the Spirit of our Lord magnified his primitive Church, when it began to ſpread and appear in the world, with many particular graces; that the Jew and Pagan might diſcern in it ſomthing extraordinary, and by that exteriour

riour sigñ be induced to beleev that the founder of that Religion was no ordinary person: as gift of miracles, tongues, and propheſies. The new converts of Corinth ſeemed to be more pleaſed with the gift of tongues, than any other; and when they met together, fell a gabling all at once, not two or three only, but more, and perhaps the greateſt part of them, all at one and the ſame time, as the Apoſtle here intimates, v. 23. one for example in the Congo language; the other that of Mexico, one Ethiopian, the other Arabian, one the Indian, another the Slavonian: and none underſtood another, nor could well hear one another for the confuſed noiſe, as we may gather by v. 2. and v. 11. and ſo became barbarians to one another. This gift then and ſpecial grace of Gods Spirit, though it might aſtoniſh a Pagan, that ſhould look upon them, which was all that holy Spirit intended by it; yet it could not edifie him any further, or move him, if he ſhould be left to himſelf, to think otherwiſe of them, than that they were a company of mad gabling diſtracted people; eſpecially when he conſidered that ſome of them ſeemed to exhort, ſome to ſing, ſome to pray, and all in a cluſter at one and the ſame time, no man heeding the other, or underſtanding a word he ſaid, if he ſhould. And this diſorder the Apoſtle here labours to rectifie in this whole fourteenth

chapter.

chapter. And it is manifeſt, that the apoſtle here neither ſpake nor thought of any Church-ſervice either in one language or other; but only of that temporal gift which is now paſt away long ago with the people that had it. Nor can it prudently be applied to any Church-ſervice that I know in the world. For there is no ſuch doing any where. Much leſs can it relate to any cuſtom of the Roman Church, where all the people are devoutly praying to one and the ſame God, in quiet and ſilence, both in ſpirit and underſtanding, heart and mind too; the prieſt knowing what himſelf ſpeaks or prayes; and the people underſtanding both what he acts and does in their behalf and his own, and what alſo they beg of God themſelves, either with words or without them. So that here is no kind of parity at all.

Nay, if neither the Prieſt did underſtand himſelf what he ſpeaks, nor the people what they pray, both which are abſolutely falſe, yet would the Apoſtle allow even that, as a good cuſtom, though not ſo perfect; ſo long as the words contained piety, and the heart ſtood pioufly affected in pronouncing them. *He that ſpeaketh in an unknown tongue*, ſaith he v. 2. *ſpeaketh not to men but to God, and though man underſtand not, yet in ſpirit he ſpeaketh myſteries.* And again v. 4. he ſaith, that ſuch an one *edifieth himſelf*: and v. 14. he teaches, that ſuch a

ones ſpirit prayeth, though his mind or underſtanding doth not: and v. 17. that he *gives thanks well*. With theſe of our learned Apoſtle your Diſſwaders words throughout this his ſection, are I am ſure abſolutely irreconcileable. For he ſaith, ſuch an one *prayes* only *with his lips*, and *not in ſpirit*; that there is *neither affection nor edification in any ſuch prayer*; and that the *heart and ſpirit ſayes nothing and asks for nothing, and ſo receives nothing, which Salomon calls the ſacrifice of fooles*; thus ſpeaks your Diſſwader quite contrary to Apoſtolical ſobriety. And not that cuſtom, I ſhould think, but your Diſſwaders invectives againſt it are irreconcileable with this fourteenth chapter. Saint Paul ſayes, that *ſuch a one prayes in ſpirit*; the Diſſwader, that *he prayes onely in his lips*. Saint Paul, that *he edifies himſelf*; the Diſſwader, that *his ſoul has no benefit*, and that there is *neither edification, nor affection, or any good by ſuch prayers*. Saint Paul, that *he prayes well*, and *gives thanks well*; the Diſſwader, that *he does ill*. But I need not ſtand upon this now. There is no ſuch thing in the uſe of the Roman Liturgy, where prieſts and people pray both in ſpirit and mind too, both with heart and underſtanding alſo.

Only let me tell you thus much, that St. Paul in one verſe of his chapter checks your Diſſwader and all his whole diſcours in this ſection:

Lin-

Linguis loqui nolite prohibere, saith he v. 39. *Do not forbid to speak with tongues.* But your Disswader forbids, and labours here might and main against it. Doth the Apostle speak here of Church-service, or not? If he do, then Church-service in an unknown tongue is allowed: if he do not, then none of this chapter is against Church-service in an unknown tongue. Surely your Disswader did never ponder these things, as he ought. Nay, if this discours of the Apostle concern Church-service, so that your Disswader hence may rightly gather, that the popish Mass in an unknown tongue is irreconcileable with it, I may upon the same ground prove more strongly, that S. Paul would have the popish Mass in an unknown tongue to be practised; *Volo omnes vos linguis loqui*, saith he v. 5. *I will that ye all speak with tongues*; or *I would that you all spake with tongues*: which is according to your Disswaders meaning, *I will have you all turn Papists*, or *I would ye were all turned Papists.*

But lastly, if this 14. chapter to the Corinthians be to be understood of Church-service and Church-preaching and Church-praying, as this dissuading Doctour would have it, then Sir must our Protestant pulpits and service-pews all down; and the Quakers way must come up infallibly. For what saith the text here. *Sive lingua quis loquitur, secundum duos aut ad multum*

tres, & per partes; & unus interpretetur: si autem non fuerit interpres, taceat in ecclesia, sibi autem loquatur & Deo. Prophetæ autem duo & tres dicant, & cæteri dijudicent. Quod si alii revelatum fuerit sedenti, prior taceat. Potestis enim omnes per singulos prophetari, ut omnes discant & omnes exhortentur. Et spiritus prophetarum prophetis subjecti sunt. This is the great result of this whole chapter: and the very utmost that the Quakers would have; and what they practice daily in their meetings. *If any speak in a tongue,* saith the Apostle, *let it be by two, or at most by three, and that by cours; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church, and speak to himself and God. Let the Prophets speak two or three, and let the other judg; and if any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace; for ye may all prophesie one by one; that all may learn, and all be exhorted or comforted. And the spirit of the prophets are subject to Prophets.* Let your Disswader now speak what he thinks; but speak it openly, that the good Quaker may as well hear him as the Papist: and speak it so effectually, that as far as in him lies, all the whole three Kingdoms may be perswaded, that this chapter concerns the publick Service of the Church. If this were once done, I believ there would not be ere long so much as one byshop or minister left in the Land. And it were a less dammage to

your Diſſwader, that adultery were reconciled to the ſeventh Commandment, than Church-ſervice to his fourteenth Chapter of Corinthians.

Why ther is a language uſed in the Catholik liturgy, which though it be not the tongue of any one Countrey, yet it is the moſt univerſally known language of the whole Catholik family upon earth, is ſufficiently diſcourſed in *Fiat Lux*. I need not ſtand here to repeat it. I muſt go on.

§. 8. *Which is about Images.*

"Sayes, that Image-worſhip, wherin Papiſts "give the ſame worſhip to the pictures as is due "to the thing repreſented, is another novelty, "and that a heatheniſh one too, brought in firſt "by Simon Magus, and then the Gnoſticks, "againſt which writes Clemens Alexandrinus, "and others: inſomuch that S. Cyril in the time "of Emperour Julian, denies that Chriſtians "did worſhip the Croſs, and Epiphanius is "ſaid to have cut in pieces a cloth picture, "wherin was the image of Chriſt or ſome "Saint. And therfore the decrees of the "ſecond Nicen Synod which had approved ima-"ges, was abrogated by another general Coun-"cel at Frankford; a little after which Coun-"cel, the Emperour ſent Claudius a godly "preacher to preach againſt Images in Italy. "And well he might, for the Councel of Eli-

"beris had long before that time declared a-
"gainſt them. And all the devices of Roman
"writers to palliate this crime are frivolous;
"for the pure primitive times would not allow
"the making of Images, as witnes Alexandri-
"nus, Tertullian, and Origen.

Here is much ado about a ſhadow. Whatſo-
ever your Diſſwader could pick up, that might
ſound but like his purpos, is here in a general
maſs heaped up together, whether it do touch
his purpos, or not at all concern it, or be haply
againſt himſelf. Theodoret, forſooth, S. Auſtin
and Irenæus, theſe muſt all teſtifie, that Simon
Magus firſt brought images into the Church,
wherof they have not any one ſuch word. The
ſame fathers with Epiphanius muſt accuſe the
Gnoſticks and Carpocratians for the ſame
thing; wheras they only blame them for placing
the pictur of Jeſus and S. Paul with Homer,
Pythagoras, Plato, Ariſtotle, and other Hea-
thens. Clemens and Origen diſown and write
againſt heathens Idolatry. So that all this con-
cerns not our purpos. The two Councels of
Eliberis and Frankford are againſt him, and ſo
is likewiſe S. Cyril who in the very place cited
objects extream ignorance to Julian the Apo-
ſtate, *who had caſt the Chriſtians in the teeth with
their worſhipping a wooden Croſs, which they would
not do to great Jupiter, and their painting the
images of it in their foreheads, and afore their*
houſes.

houses. And Saint Cyril tells Julian, that the Cross put Christians in mind of the vertue and good which Christ their Lord had done and suffered for them, which the good Doctour calls the *precious and health-giving wood.* And we may see not only by S. Cyrils answer, but by the objections of the Apostate Julian, what manner of Christians ther were in those dayes, fourteen hundred years ago.

The Councel of Eliberis was kept in Spain, in the time of Emperour Galerius, when many Christians by reason of the bitterness of persecution, sacrificed through fear unto the heathen gods, and much contumely was done all over the world, and especially in Spain, both to Christians themselves, and the holy Gospel, and all sacred things. Wherfor the Councel laid heavy pennances on all such Christians as should so apostatize either into heathenisme, heresie, or the notorious sin of adultery; and amongst other things, c. 36. ordained that *no sacred pictures should be painted upon the walls*, becaus namely there they stood fixed, and were liable to the contumely of pagans, wheras such as were in frames and tables, might easily be removed and put into a safe place. That Councel of Eliberis, becaus they adjoyn not a reason unto their decree, may easily be mistaken; although the one may be discerned in the other, by a judicious and serious reader, *Ne quod colitur*

aut adoratur, saith the Councel, *in parietibus depingatur*. For the picture properly speaking, terminates neither respect nor contumely, but the thing represented by it, which if it be divine, must not receiv contumely, if it can be helped, from wicked men.

But the Councel of Frankford I cannot but wonder, why your Disswader should cite it as an enemy to Images. Did not that Councel consist of Catholik or popish Prelates, 300. of them gathered together under the Legates of Pope Adrian the first; in which also the Emperour Charles the Great, as stout a Champion of the Roman Church as any ever was in the world, was actually present. *O but Eginard, Hincmar, Amonius, Blondus, and others testifie that the said Councel of Frankford condemned the second Nicen Synod, wherin images were established, calling it an Antichristian assembly.* But how can this be thought probable, nay I may say possible, of those two Councels?. being so near one another, that ther were not above eight or nine years space between them, and both of them under one and the same Pope Adrian the first. Can any beleev this, though twenty Eginards should say it? But he is not found indeed to speak ought of it, Hincmar sayes, that they of Frankford condemned *the Synod assembled at Nice without the Popes authority*. But that Nicen Synod was both assembled and confirmed by the autho-

authority of that very same Pope who called and ratified this of Frankford. Blondus sayes, that they *abrogated the seventh Synod, and the Felician heresie de tollendis imaginibus.* And none of them say, that they of Frankford called that Nicen Synod an Antichristian assembly, or that they published any book to that purpos. What strange confidence then is this of your Disswader, to talk thus at random, without book, and besides all rule, and against truth.

The occasion of assembling this Councel of Frankford were the misdemeanours of Elipandus Byshop of Tolledo in Spain. For Felix Urgelitanus his Countreyman having consulted Elipandus concerning that scholastick difficulty, *Whether Christ as man ought to be called the natural, or only the adoptive Son of God,* by means of his discours, and a book written by him upon that subject, beleeved and said against the ancient language of the Church, that Christ was to be held an adoptive child of God, and not his natural son. And these two, together with Claudius Taurinensis, who came to them from Italy, filled all Spain with the clamour. This act of theirs was fond as well as wicked. For though in the schoo's it might haply be held, that Christ as man is not the natural but only the adoptive Son of God, if that particle *as*, be taken for a note of reduplication; yet they could not be ignorant, that beleevers have nothing to do with such

such nice logical points. These conceiv Christ altogether specifically, as he is in himself. And so they had ever beleeved him to be the only begotten natural Son of God, and we all so many as are made partakers of his grace, adopted in him. And he that shall preach Christ to be *as man*, only his adoptive Son, whether that *as* of his be taken reduplicatively or specificatively, he makes but an ass of himself and a knave to boot. But these three, though often admonished, yet would they not desist. And therfor in a Councel at Ratisbone, Fælix by name was condemned, respect being then had to the person and dignity of the Archbyshop of Toledo, and the other Byshop. Fælix therfor was brought to the Emperour Charles his Court, who then wintered at Rheginum; where after a while, he humbly submitted to the Councel, there then met together; and from thence sent to the presence of Pope Adrian, in the Cathedral of S. Peter he publickly acknowledged his errour, and returned home to his own City. Elipand when he heard of all this, grew more violent than before; and laboured not only with his whole endeavour to reclaim Fælix to his former errour, but by letters patent and large dated to all the Byshops of France and Germany, to draw those two Kingdoms to his opinion. Wherupon Fælix returned again to his vomit. And least the infection should spread

any

any further, by the agreement of the Pope and Charles the Emperour, a Councel was called at Frankford. This was the very busines and occasion of that Councel: wherby every one may discern himself not only the improbability, that the said Councel of Frankford, which purposely met together to maintain the honour of Christ, should deface his figures; but the falsity also of this your Disswader, who tells us, that a while after this Councel of Frankford, Ludovicus son to Charles the great, sent Claudius a famous Oratour to preach against images in Italy, *p.* 60. Wheras Claudius had troubled Italy and Spain too, three or four years before that Councel, nay before the Councel of Ratisbone, which was two years before, and his way was condemned with himself both at Ratisbone and Frankford too.

These things being so, how in the name of God comes your Disswader here against so much reason to aver, that the *Councel of Frankford declared against images*, that they *condemned the second Nicen Synod, wherin the use of Images had been maintained*, that they *published a book wherin that Synod was declared Antichristian*, and that *Ludovicus Charlemains son sent down Claudius after that Councel to preach against Images in Italy*. I know that other Protestants have been guilty too of some part of this his story; so far at least as to say in particular, that the Frank-

Frankford Councel was against images. But they never set down any of that Councels declaration against them, nor is ther any extant. Binius, who set forth all the Councels at large, both shows and copiously proves, that the acts of the second Nicen Councel were all confirmed in the Councel of Frankford; which is also averred by Alanus, Surius, Vasquez, and several other learned men. And since it is likely enough, that somthing was done in this Councel about Images, wherof ther is so much talk in the world, ther can nothing be thought more rational, than that Pope Adrian, whose legates presided in both the Councels, should according to the Churches custom send those decrees of Nice about the same time lately finished, unto the Councel now at Frankford; that the definition of the Nicen Councel might be made known to all the West, by their acceptation and promulgation at Frankford. Which also that it was absolutely done, and no other thing done but it, may sufficiently be gathered by the authority of the Councel of Senon, which in the 14. of their decrees speaks thus: *Carolus magnus Francorum rex Christianissimus in Francofordiensi conventu, ejusdem erroris Iconomachorum suppressit insaniam quam infelicissimus quidam Felix in Gallias & Germanias invexerat.* And the same is ratified by Platina, who in the life of Pope Adrian, *Biennio post*, saith he, *Theophylactus &*

Ste-

Stephanus Episcopi insignes Adriani nomine Francorum & Germanorum Synodum habuerunt, in qua & Synodus quam septimam Graci appellabant & hæresis Faliciana de tollendis imaginibus abrogata est: as also by Paulus Emilius, who in his second book *de gestis Francorum*, speaking of that Councel of Frankford, *Et imaginibus*, saith he, *suus honor restitutus est*. The like may be proved out of Blondus in his Decads, Sabellicus his Æneads, Gabliſards Chronology, Alanus his Dialogues, Nauclerus, &c. All which various testimonies joyned in one; together with the motives of that Frankford Councel; the great procurer and protector of that Councel, Charles the great, an eminent Champion of the Roman Church; the Presidents of that Councel, Theophylact and Stephen, legates of the same Pope Adrian, who had lately finished and confirmed the second Councel of Nice, may suffice, I should think, to refute the trifling humour of this Disswader. But his confidence is greater in his readers light beleef, then either the weight or truth of his own words.

But *all the devices of Roman writers to palliate this their crime*, he sayes, *are frivolous*. What are these devices, and what is their crimes? Sir, where there is no crime, there needs not any palliating devices. Is it a crime to keep an image of Christ crucified for us, that we may be often put in mind of the good and vertue of his

his holy passion, and our fansie assisted and kept in at our prayers, within the compass of their object? This is the busines Sir, speak directly unto this, before you go any further. You will make all sorts of prophane Images, either to some civil use or indifferent, or perhaps a naughty end. This is no crime with you. If it be, how comes it to pass, that never any bysshop or other minister in England, who scribble with such a stiff impertinency against Popish Images, have never laboured at all against these Protestant pictures. *O but Protestants do not worship these pictures.* Do they not? I would to God, that all good Catholiks could so heartily love, imitate, and worship those blessed persons represented in their portraictures, as Protestants do theirs, who by such amorous faces in their curious dresses are brought, I fear, too often on their knees. Motives to filthy iniquity, they may stand, but representation of austerity, of contemplation, of martyrdom, of divine extasies, of charity, of our Lord Jesus, and his Saints, these are popish, these are antichristian, these are abominable. If the God of holines will not have any sacred figures to be made, surely he cannot allow lascivious, prophane, and light ones. But though he do not, our Ministers will. *O but the Papists give the same worship to the representation, and the thing represented.* This your Disswader may gather haply by his own ex-

experience. For the figure of a King, a father, and a wife, if they do raise any affections or thoughts, these must needs be so much differing, as the persons represented are. For the shadow, figure, or representation, if we would speak according to right philosophy, neither does nor can terminate any such respect, though it may its own. For example, (that I may declare this my speech) put case I have three or four Crucifixes before me, of a several make or form, and of a much differing art. All these four figures have but one and the same representation, becaus they represent but one and the same thing Christ Jesus our Lord crucified for our reconciliation and redemption: and whatever good affection may arise in my heart upon the sight and thought of it, must needs be the same to that representation and thing represented: becaus it is terminated upon the thing represented by means of the representation of it. And that is but one and the same respect, though the figures be many. For the representation or figure can terminate no such thought, although it be a means of directing it. But yet all those four figures have respects of their own, which they bound and terminate themselves; by reason, for example, of the excellency of their colours, the material on which they are wrought, the exactness of art in limning every part to the life, and the proportions of the whole in its due and

full

full measure. These and such like considerations are ended fully in the picture, without any consideration had to its object represented. And they may be of such concerment in the business, that a man may be moved to prefer one of those four pictures before all the other three. This is that I mean Sir, when I say that a shadow, figure or representation neither does nor can terminate any such respect as results naturally upon the samplar or prototype, though it may its own. And this is no sophistry of Aristotle, but meer natural and vulgar reason, common to all mankind.

O but the Papists make their pictures their gods. I, this is the talk of black ministers in the dark, to fools and children; while they sit warm in the Roman Catholik Benefices which they have invaded, it behooves them to say, what ever they can think against Popery, be it right, be it wrong, be it sence or nonsence. All goes down by a people once inveigled. And if they be not still kept warm in their mistake, the minister is lost. Good God, in what a world do we live! I did my self beleev all this once. And I wondred, when I first saw Roman Catholiks to tear their pictures somtime, and put them into the fire. It is no such marvel, if Epiphanius should tear a Saints picture, which your Diswader here tells us, although that story be not found in that epistle of Epiphanius translated by

St.

St. Jerom, Roman Catholiks do it ordinarily. For they use picturs but as they do their prayer-books, and when they are so sullied and worn they can use them no more, they are turned both into ashes, which is the last end of picturs, books, and men. And the respect they give to pictures, is but the very same kind, with what they give to the holy Gospels; save only that the Gospel is looked on as the inside, and a Crucifix the outside of their Redeemer; but both are still but shadows of him.

I could say more concerning this busines, and make it appear both that Christians have ever in all ages had images of their Lord and his Saints in their houses and Churches, and how profitable and useful they are, and that they are neither against the will of God, nor any right reason. And this I could clearly prove out of S. Basil, Eusebius Cæsarienſis, S. Gregory Nazianzen and Nyssen, S. Austin, Bede, Jo. Damascen, Athanasius, Ambrose, Chrysostom. But I have here said enough, if I have enough demonstrated, as I think I have, that your Dissuader has said nothing.

§. 9. *Which is an appendage to the former.*

"Reprovs the picturing of God the Father and "holy Trinity, which many of the holy Fathers "speak against, much to the blame of the Ro-"man Church, which in their Mass-books and "Breviaries, Portuises and Manuals picture the

"holy Trinity with three noſes, and four eyes, "and three faces in a knot.

Though the Catholik Chriſtian Church hath ever uſed and approved of the uſe of Images, as well as ſpiritual books, yet they allow not of any abuſe in either. And Ordinaries, Byſhops, Viſitors, and Superiours in all places are to look to that. So that in this his appendage, as he calls it, your Diſſwader acts but the part of a good Viſitour, to blame and mend that which is amiſs; which muſt continually be done, and continually is done all over the Catholick world, as well in this, as other affairs. And if any Ordinary be negligent herein, he is worthy of blame. But Sir, this is nothing of Popery or Catholik Religion; which allows only in general the uſe of pious figures, to forward our thoughts and deſires to that eternal felicity above, which ſo many holy Virgins, Confeſſours, Martyrs, Apoſtles, Monks, Hermits, and pious Princes, portrayed all before our eyes, arrived unto, by their auſterities, alms-deeds, purity, faſtings, diſciplines, meditations, watchings, and patient ſufferings, in love and conformity to their holy Redeemer, who is the prince, and leader, and crown of all thoſe his glorious Saints, redeemed and ſanctified by the vertue of his precious blood and paſſion, out of the thraldom of Satan and this wicked world. Nor has Catholik Religion ever deſcended unto

the

the particular circumstances of these figures. This belongs to the care of Bishops and Ordinaries. Catholiks have generally no figures, but of such only, as once have lived amongst them in their Church, either as head or members of it. Nor of many ages would bishops permit the holy Trinity, especially God the Father to be pourtrayed at all. And if now they suffer it, they have for it I make no doubt a sufficient reason; especially since they heed not at all, however your Dissuader imagines, any natural similitude in any of their pictures. If they be so made, as to raise the fansie to thoughts above, and the love and vertues that may bring us thither, they care not whether, for example, Saint Bennet were a man just of that complexion, or Christ their Redeemer of those direct features the limner has given him. They come not into their Churches, nor do they cast their eyes upon their pictures for any such end. And if God the Father be represented to their eyes, as he is to their ears, when he is called *Father*, I see no harm in it. If we may use such a form of words, when we speak to God, as this world we live in may afford our ears, why may not the eyes have such an answerable form too. But this is a business, which your Dissuader, if he were a Catholik, might well propound in the next general Councel, and do otherwise in the mean time, if so he please in his own Diocess.

For neither books nor picturs can be uſed in any Dioceſs, but what the Ordinary of the place allows. And the Byſhop ſtill guides himſelf by the general doctrin and diſcipline, the faith and cuſtom, the tradition and laws of the Church in the whole mannagement of his care. And when theſe do not clearly deſcend to any particular which he is to deal with, he uſes therin his own diſcretion, going that way, if he do well, that he findes comes neareſt to the rule, as temporal ſuperiours alſo do in their affairs.

O but the Roman Church with much ſcandal, and againſt nature and the reaſon of mankind in their maſs-books and breviaries, portuiſes and manuels picture the holy Trinity with three noſes, and four eyes, and three faces in a knot. And do they ſo? I have ſeen I think as many Catholik countreys, and maſs-books, and breviaries, portuiſes, and manuels, as your Diſſwader ever did, and yet I never ſaw any ſuch picture therin all my life. He has been it ſeems an earneſt pryer into the front and faces of books. But did he not miſtake, trow you? and take ſome *fortune-book*, written in old letters, for a maſs-book? and thence conclude, that all breviaries and maſs-books, portuiſes and manuels were ſtored with ſuch figures. However it were, the picture was to blame. For three noſes and three faces ought to have more than four eyes. And if ther were but four eyes, I cannot ſee how ther ſhould

should be three whole faces, although ther were there three noses in it. But this is as good stuff, and as true, and as pertinent too, as any other part of this his book, which he calls a Dissuasive from Popery.

§. 10. *Which is against Papal authority.*

"Sayes, that the Popes universal bishoprick "is another novelty, though not so ridiculous, "yet as dangerous as any other. And a novelty "it is, for Christ left his Church in the hands "of the Apostles, without any superiority of "one above another. And in the Councel of "Jerusalem, James and not Peter gave the de-"cisive sentence. Christ sent all his Apostles "with the same whole power, as his Father "sent him. Therfor. S. Paul bid the bishops of "Miletum feed the whole flock. And well said "S. Cyprian, that the Apostles were all the same "that S. Peter was. And this equality of pow-"er must descend to all bishops, who succeed "the Apostles in their ordinary power, as em-"bassadours for Christ. So then by the law of "Christ one bishop is not superiour to an-"other. Christ made no head of bishops. Be-"yond the bishop is no step, till you rest in the "great shepheard and bishop of souls. Un-"der him every bishop is supream in spiri-"tuals, and in all power which to any bishop "is given by Christ. And that this was ever be-"leeved in ancient times, is proved by Pope

" Eleutherius his epistle to the bysshops of " France, by S. Ambrose, S. Cyprian, Pope " Symmachus, S. Denyse, Ignace, Gelasius, Je- " rom, Fulgentius, and even Pope Gregory the " great. Wherfor S. Paul expressly sayes, that " Christ appointed in his Church first Apostles, " but not S. Peter first. Nor did Peter ever " rule but by common councel, as S. Chryso- " stom witnesses. And it is even confest by " som of the Romish party, that the succession " is not tyed to Rome, as Cusanus, Soto, Dri- " edo, Canus and Segovius. Nor was any thing " known therof in the primitive times; when " the bysshops of Asia and Africa opposed Pope " Victor and Pope Stephen; and all bysshops " treated with the Roman bysshop as with a " brother not superiour, and a whole general " Councel gave to the bysshop of C. P. equal " right and preheminence with the bysshop of " Rome. Finally, Christ gave no command- " ment to obey the bysshop of Rome, and pro- " bably never intended any such thing.

A man would surely think Sir, that this nail is knocked in to the head. What could be said more? But to be brief with you. If all the other sections of this your Dissuasive have said nothing, this I may say speaks somthing wors than nothing. For his reasons are senceles; his testimonies either impertinent or manifestly against himself; and his whole discours con-

trary

trary to the laws and constitutions of our English Protestant Church.

To begin with the last: whether you look upon the statutes and acts of Parliament, whereby our English Church and government were first settled in England upon the reformation in the dayes of Edward the sixth, and afterwards ratified: or the articles, canons, and constitutions that were agreed upon by the byshops and clergy, and confirmed both by King Edward, Queen Elizabeth, King James, and our good King Charles, we shall clearly see, that our English Protestant Church and government is Monarchical; and that byshops are as much subjected to their Arch-byshops, as Ministers to Byshops; and Arch-byshops in like manner to the King, in whom the Episcopal power is radical and inherent, and in whom is the fulness of ecclesiastical authority, and from whom byshops do receiv their place, authority, power, and jurisdiction. And that Parson, Vicar, or other Doctour, who shall write or speak contrary to this; by the constitutions and canons ecclesiastical made in the time of our late good King Charles, he is to be suspended; and by the Canons and constitutions ecclesiastical made and confirmed in the Reign of King James, he is excommunicated *ipso facto*; and by the laws of Queen Elizabeth and King Edward to be further punished. How comes it then that

this your disswading Doctour utterly dissolves all this frame of government, under pretence of talking against papal power, as contrary to the mind and will of Christ; which will and mind is notwithstanding most resolutely asserted by the constitutions and laws of this our very English Church and Kingdom, which rejected indeed the Roman seat and person, but retained still the power and ordination of Church-government; which finally rested, now no longer in any Roman byshop, but in our own princely monarch. If any will but take the pains to look upon our constitutions and statutes he will soon find all this to be most true. This your Disswader in despight of all our laws to the contrary, will have the government of Christs Church not to be monarchical, but a pure aristocracy, ruled by a company of byshops, standing like a company of trees, all in a row, one by another, but no one between the other and heaven. An order he admits or precedency, according as I suppose as one begins to count or number them, but no jurisdiction, no power, no autority, no superiority of any one over the rest. *One byshop*, sayes he, *is not superiour to another, Christ made no head of byshops. Beyond the byshop is no step, till you rest in the great shepherd and byshop of souls. Under him every byshop is supream in spirituals, and in all power which to any byshop is given by Christ.* But the laws of

the

the land and constitutions of our English Protestant Church, teach us on the contrary, that one bishop is superiour to another, and he therefor called an Arch-bishop; and that according to Christ ther is a head both of Bishops and and Arch-bishops; so that ther is one other step yet, before you rest in the great shepherd and bishop of souls, even he who is under Christ supream head and governour of his Church in these his Majesties realms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and that under Christ every bishop is not supream in spirituals, or *in all power*; mark, I say he is not supream in all power, which to any bishop is given by Christ.

The statutes and acts of Parliament are in every mans hands to look into. But the canons and ecclesiastical constitutions, becaus they are not so obviqus, I shall name one or two of them, to justifie this my speech. In our canonical law made in Kings Edwards dayes, ther is an act tit. 189. *De officio & jurisdictione omnium judicum*, which speaks thus. *Si Episcopus fuerit negligens in administrandâ justitiâ, pertinet ad ejus Archiepiscopum, ipsum compellere ad jus dicendum; illique terminum præscribet, quem si non observaverit absq; legitimo impedimento, non modò censuris ecclesiasticis puniet, verum & in æstimationem justam litis damnabit.* It is manifest by this canon, that every bishop is not supream; but that one is superiour and head over the other;

other; so far, as to compel and punish him: which cannot justly be done, without autority and power. Ther is another canon or law yet more full than this, tit. 92. *De ecclesia & ministris ejus*, which speaks thus. *Omnia quæ de Episcopis constituta sunt, ad se pertinere Archiepiscopi quoq; agnoscant. Et præter illa, munus illorum est, in suâ provinciâ episcopos collocare, cum à nobis*, saith the King, *electi fuerint. Utq; totius provinciæ suæ statum melius intelligat Archiepiscopus, semel provinciam suam universam si possit ambibit & visitabit. Et quoties contigerit aliquas vacare sedes episcopales, episcoporum locos, non modo in visitatione, sed etiam in beneficiorum collocatione, & omnibus aliis functionibus ecclesiasticis implebit. Quin & ubi episcopi sunt, si eos animadvertat in suis muneribus curandis & præsertim in corrigendis vitiis tardiores & negligentiores esse, quàm in gregis Domini præfectis ferri possit, primum illos paterne monebit. Quod si monitione non profuerit, illi jus esto alios in eorum loco collocare. Appellantium etiam ad se querelas causasq; judicabit. Episcopi suæ provinciæ si qua de re inter se contenderint aut litigarint, judex & finitor inter eos esto Archiepiscopus. Ad hæc audiet & judicabit accusationes contra episcopos suæ provinciæ. Ac denique, si ille contentiones aut lites inter episcopum & archiepiscopum ortæ fuerint, nostro judicio* saith the King, who ratifies these ecclesiastical canons, and puts them forth in his own name, *cognoscentur & definiti-*

finientur. Archiepiscopi quoq; munus esto synodos provinciales nostro jussu convocare. By this constitution of canon, one of those canons on which our very English Protestant Church is founded, it manifestly appears, that an Archbyshop, or in plain English a prime byshop or chief byshop is not a name only of order or decent precedency, as your Disswader here speaks, but of dignity, autority, power, superiority, and jurisdiction over byshops. And he is as much above them, as other ordinary byshops are above a Presbyter or parochial minister. For in administring Sacraments, and preaching Gods word, every minister is impowred as fully as any byshop: but the government of ministers or presbyters within the Diocess, is proper only to one, who therfor has the name and title of byshop, which signifies an Overseer of the rest. This byshop admits of presbyters into a parish, and when any parish is vacant, he sees that one be put in: if any be careles and negligent in the duty of his parish, he first advises him like a father, and if he will not amend his manners, he puts him out, and furnishes the place with a better pastour: he judges the complaints between parishioners and parsons, or between parsons or presbyters among themselves, and decides them: he visits and keeps chapter, or should do at least, and finds and speaks, and punishes their faults. All these things

things are contained in the office of a byshop, which therfor argue him to have an autority, power, or jurisdiction over other Presbyters or pastours within his Dioces: although he be a presbyter or pastour himself, and a chief one too, that is to say, with a more ample and larg autority, then any one of those who he under him hath given them; and therfor called a byshop or overseer by way of eminence. And if all these things do, as needs they must, argue not only an order or bare precedency, but a jurisdiction and power of a byshop over other presbyters; then must they needs conclude the same power to be in one byshop over another, in him namely, who by way of eminency is called *the byshop* or *archbyshop*, or *prime byshop* amongst the rest, who is as truly the byshop of byshops, as these are overseers of presbyters. For this prime byshop is declared by the aboveſaid canon, to be enabled by vertue of his office, to have all the power and charge that other byshops have; and then over and above that, first to place the byshops elect, and seat them each one in their provinces; then to go over and visit the whole province authoritatively, which none of the byshops under him can do: thirdly to see vacant seats supplied: fourthly, if such byshops as he shall find slow and negligent in their duty, after a fatherly admonishment, mend not, to put others in their

place:

place: fifthly, to judg the complaints and causes of such as appeal unto him from their own byshops: sixthly, to decide the controversies that may happen between one byshop and another: seventhly, to judg the accusations that are against any byshop: lastly, to call synods, and there conclude and decide what may seem best for the welfare and spiritual government of his province. Are these the works of authority, power, and jurisdiction, yea or no? If they be not, how can any autority or power be proved? For all power is proved by its act; or how in particular may it appear, that byshops have any autority over their presbyters or ministers? But if they be, then is there more than *a precedency or order amongst byshops*: then did not *Christ leav his Church in the hands of the Apostles without any superiority of one above another*, as this Dissuader talks: For the laws and constitutions of this our Church and Kingdom, do publikly atteſt that this our English Church is settled according to the will of Christ, by archbyshops and byshops, which is absolutely true; then also did not *Christ send all his apostles with the same whole power*; then were not *all the apostles the same that Peter was*; then did not *an equality of power descend from the apostles to all byshops*: then is there *a step beyond the ordinary byshop*, nay two steps, before *you come to rest in the great shepherd and byshop of souls*; then, *under Christ*

Christ is not every bishop supream in spiritualls, not yet in all the power which to any bishop is given by Christ; all this I say is true, whatsoever your Dissuader talks against not only the Catholik Church and government, which was here for above a thousand years together in England, but against the very frame and constitution of his own Protestant Church, wherof he is himself an unworthy member. But ministers when they begin to talk against popery, they are so heedlesly earnest, that they knock out their own brains; and either to get a benefice or honour in it, they destroy their own Church that gives it them. I can no more wonder now, that such an one as Whitby, in his book written against worthy Cressy, should say so peremptorily, that *an archbyshop hath no power & autority*, and *that his grace of Canterbury hath no jurisdiction*, as he there talks, *impar congressus Achilli*, since a man of such renown, as Doctor Taylor, should speak the same here, and give the Presbyterians and other Sectaries in the Land, such a fair occasion and president to undermine and overthrow that Church, which is but lately lift out of the ruins of their hands. The same argument, that proves the byshop, an ordinary byshop to be under none but immediately under Christ, will prove as much for a single Presbyter or Presbyterian. And it is already done by the subtle pen of John Eastwick, in his *Apologeticus*

geticus ad præsules Anglicanos, which book is so strongly written both against Popish and Protestant Prelacy too, that upon the grounds on which all Protestants go, it can never be answered; and upon the grounds Doctour Taylor here layes, it is all of it in a manner confirmed and made good. What a strange madnes is it for any one, that he may seem to weaken another Church, to overthrow his own. Truth is, here is no tye in England, that any one will be held with. The scriptur is in every mans bosom to make what he will of it. Ancient canons, customs and councels they slight as erroneous. Their own constitutions and statutes they do not so much as heed. What can be expected from hence but eternal dissention and wars.

Nay the minister to get his orders and benefice, the bishop to enter into his See, make a solemn protestation of obedience and subjection. When they have got their ends, they wipe their mouths, and so far forget what they have done, that they write and act presently, as if they had never thought any such thing. See here the form of consecration of bishops prescribed and used by our English Protestant Church. *In the name of God. Amen. I N. chosen bishop of the Church or See of N. do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the archbishop and to the Metropolitan Church of N. and to their successours.*

So

So help me God through Jesus Christ. Where reverence, subjection and obedience is due on one side, there must needs be autority, power and jurisdiction on the other. And that man, who hath One set over him with such an authority under Christ, cannot be immediately under Christ himself; and if he affirm he is so, then *ipso facto* doth he reject and rebel against that autority which in words he acknowledged. This is Dr. Taylors case, who teaches here, that *Bishops are successours of the Apostles*; and that ther was no *superiority amongst the Apostles*; that by the *law of Christ one bishop is not superiour to another*; that Christ *made no head of bishops*; that *beyond the bishop is no step, till you rest in the great shepherd and bishop of souls, &c.* What is this, but to reject all obedience and loyalty, solemnly vowed and promised? and to rebell against all the laws and constitutions of his own Church; and finally, which is wors than all the rest, to give an example to disaffected ministers of doing the like?

But how does he prove all this? very copiously both by reasons of his own, and autorities of other men. Only the mishap is, those signifie nothing at all for him; these, very much against him. But what are his reasons? *Bishops are the Apostles successours; and ther was no superiour amongst the Apostles.* Mr. Bastwick and such as he will tell you, Sir, that *priest, minister,*

&c. and

and *bysshop* were but several synonomous words for one and the same thing upon divers respects: so that it is to be feared your Disswader hath proved too much here, and hath spoken against himself; but if he hath not proved too much, he hath proved nothing. I am sure there was a superiority amongst the Apostles, and shall demonstrate it by and by, as well as I can. In the mean time, how prove you ther was none? *Christ sent all his apostles with the same whole power, his father sent him.* Good Sir, our Lord sayes indeed, *as my father sent me, so do I send you*; giving them a legal commission from him, as himself had from God his eternal Father. But that he sent them every one with the same *whole power*, that is, so to teach and govern, that they should be subject to no one amongst them, these are your Disswaders words, cast in by fraud and fallacy, and no autority evangelical; and therfor prove nothing. Nay if Christ had so sent his Apostles, every one with the whole power of governing in himself, then had he changed his fathers commission. For he was sent himself to be one head and governour; and yet he had then constituted many. But how can you dream, good Doctour, that Christ sent his apostles, each one with all his whole power he had received from God, since the very chiefest of his power, which is to confer grace upon the ministerial acts of his words and sacraments, cannot be given to man.

You see how fondly as well as falsly you have foisted in these words, *with all his whole power.* What follows next. *S. Paul bid the byshops of Miletum feed the whole flock.* Pray Sir how many byshops were ther, do you think, in that one, no huge town of Miletum. Bastwick brings this for a proof, that byshops and priests were all one thing in those dayes. And if it be otherwise, the times are much changed. Then many byshops served one town; now many towns will hardly serve one byshop. But you cut off the sentence Sir, that it may sound better for your purpos, and, which is wors, change it too. The Apostle charges them to *attend to themselves and all the flock, wherin the holy Ghost hath constituted them overseers.* Which last words becaus they limit both their care and your own argument, you thought it prudence to leav them out. Pray Sir, would you have any byshop to enter upon anothers Dioces? What then would you have here, when you make S. Paul bid the pastors all of them to feed all *the whole flock,* without any restriction? In all your heats remember still your self. Go on. *The equality of power must descend to all byshops, who are their successours.* I can easily grant you, that they have all of them equal power of administring Sacraments, and looking to their flock, every one within his own precincts. And this is all your discours infers. But an equality of power over one another, was neither amongst the

Apo-

Apoſtles; nor yet here in our Engliſh byſhops, nor ever in the Church of God. How do you prove that? *By the law of Chriſt one byſhop is not ſuperiour to another, Chriſt made no head of byſhops: beyond the byſhop is no ſtep till you reſt in the great ſhepheard and byſhop of ſouls. Under him every byſhop is ſupream.* This argument is in a mood and figure called *Ita dico.* You ſay ſo: and the ſtatutes and canons of the Church of England ſay no. Whom ſhall we beleev? I alwayes prefer a Church before any one Churchman, though he be in her, when he is againſt her. But *S. Paul ſayes expreſly, that Chriſt appointed in his Church firſt apoſtles, but not S. Peter firſt.* I marry Sir! now we are come to an argument indeed. And it runs thus, *According to S. Paul, the apoſtles were the firſt rank or dignity in the Church: but S. Peter was none of that rank or dignity, therfor he could not be firſt.* Was not S. Peter then one of the apoſtles? or will you make it run thus? *The apoſtles were the firſt rank or dignity in the Church, but S. Peter was not that rank or dignity, therfor he was not firſt.* This is indeed the ſurer way. Becaus no one man can be reckoned for a rank or dignity, or ſo many perſons in the plural number. This is an argument never yet thought of in Oxford or Cambridg, to prove they have no ſuperiour either over all, or over any one Colledge. Not over all: For ther be firſt Colledges, then

Halls, then Inns, &c. therfor the Vice-Chancellour is not first. Not over one Colledge: For ther are first Fellows, then Schollars, then Penſioners, &c. and therfor Mr. *ſuch a one* who is neither fellows, ſchollars, nor penſioners is not firſt. So here, *Chriſt*, ſaith S. Paul, *ſet in his Church firſt of all apoſtles*, therfor ſaith our learned Doctour, *not firſt S. Peter, and ſecondarily apoſtles, but all the apoſtles were firſt.* The apoſtles were the firſt rank of dignity, good Sir, but that rank had order in it too. And ſo ther might be place for a firſt man, even in the firſt rank. But *Peter did never rule but by common councel, as S. Chryſoſtome witneſſes.* He ruled then good Sir, it ſeems he ruled then. Will you bring this for an argument of his not ruling? You are ſhrewdly put to it in the mean time. And if he ruled and governed and mannaged all by common councel, he was the better ſuperiour for that; but not therfor no ſuperiour. Will you admit no rulers but tyrants, who do all by their own will. But *even ſome of their own popiſh writers do grant, that the ſucceſſion is not tied to Rome, as Cuſanus, Soto, Canus, Driedo, Segovius.* What does that opinion of theirs, if they did ſay ſo, prove againſt the ſovereignty of one byſhop over the reſt, which is the only thing now in hand, wherever he reſide? I cannot in reaſon be thought to ſpeak againſt our Engliſh monarchy, although I ſhould haply ſay,

that

that the King is not bound to reſide ſtill at Weſtminſter. The papal paſtour hath ever ſince S. Peters time, ever reſided yet in that Roman Dioceſs, which Catholiks do indeed conſider as a thing ſomwhat ſtrange; ſince all other apoſtolical Sees beſides that, are failed and gone; but no man knows the diſpoſition of divine providence here on earth for future times. Perhaps that Roman See, I mean the particular Roman Dioceſs ſhall ſo remain to the worlds end; and perhaps again it may not. And if it ſhould not, or if that whole City ſhould be deſtroyed, or Chriſtian Religion in it; or if the City and all the whole Kingdom of Italy ſhould lye under the ocean, quite overwhelmed and drowned, yet ſo long as the world laſts, ther ſhall be a Church of Chriſt on earth; and ſo long as ther is a Church, ther will be one ſupream paſtour of it, where ever he reſide. And this is that which ſom Catholik doctours mean, when they ſay that the ſucceſſion is not tied to Rome. What doth this make to your purpos Mr. Diſſwader? Go on then. *No papal ſovereignty was thought of in primitive times, when the byſhops of Aſia and Africa oppoſed Pope Victor and Pope Stephen.* Does an oppoſition infer a nullity of power? Then Sir ther would be no power upon earth either eccleſiaſtical or civil; which are all reſiſted one time or other. Was there no royalty or byſhops in England ſo much

as thought of thirty years ago, when they were both of them more than opposed by the rabble? What miserable shifts are these! You may find, and I am confident you do find and know well enough, that even in those times you speak of, and before and after them, the papal power was acknowledged and reverenced by the whole world: and yet you will take advantage of a dispute, that happens more or less in all ages, to say against your conscience, and from thence infer, that the papal power was not so much as thought of in those primitive times. God keep you Sir from contesting with any of your servants. For if you do, this argument of yours will prove, that your autority in your own hous was not so much as thought of in those dayes, either by you, or them, or any els. Have you any thing els to say? *A general Councel of Chalcedon gave to the byshop of C. P. equal rights and preheminence with the byshop of Rome.* What general Councel was that? and who is that C. P. and what were those equal rights universal over all, or by way of similitude over some? A Constable may have given him equal rights and preheminence in his lesser charge unto som purposes, as a King hath in his whole Kingdom: what then? If this prove any thing, it is, that there is a sovereign power over all, in proportion to which, is measured out the right and authority of another in order to one particular.

But

But *all byſhops ever treated with the Roman Byſhop as with a brother, not as a ſuperiour.* As brother and ſuperiour too, he both treated with them and they with him, as I could eaſily ſhow at large. But to a bare falſ affirmation one ſingle negation will ſuffice. *Chriſt gave no command to obey the byſhop of Rome, and probably never intended any ſuch thing.* He commanded and probably intended, that all ſhould obey thoſe *that were ſet over them.* Is not that enough? I pray you Sir tell me, did he give any command to obey the byſhop of Canterbury here in England, or the byſhop of Armagh in Ireland, or probably ever intend any ſuch thing? Speak out. If he did, the Roman Prelate will chailenge obeyſance upon the ſame title: if he did not, then is your promiſe and vow in epiſcopal ordination inſignificant and fond. But *James and not Peter gave the deciſive ſentence in the Councel at Jeruſalem.* And why ſay you ſo? How prove you that his words and not the other were deciſive, when one of them did but ſecond the other.

Now ſince your Diſſwader hath proved after his manner, that ther is not any one ſovereign byſhop over all, pray give me leav Sir to let you know, why I think on the contrary, that one ſuch there is and ought to be. And to omit teſtimonies, which are in this point innumerable, I ſhall for brevities ſake only uſe two reaſons.

The first is: That Christ our Lord would have the whole company of Christians upon earth ever to be and remain one flock. This I conceiv can never be, except they be all under one visible pastour. Nor can it suffice to say here, that they are all under one Christ and one God: For this can never make them all, either really to be, or truly to be called one flock on earth. All the Kingdoms and people in the world, however they be governed, are under one God the supream King, as the whole Church is said to be under one Christ: but this makes them not to be one Kingdom. Nay, those that have not a visible King, are not any Kingdom at all; but an aristocracy only, or commonwealth, or wild straglers. But if you will have no visible flock of Christians upon earth, you teach the Quakers doctrin, and abolish all government. It is certain then, that if the ecclesiastical government of each place, do end in the byshop of that respective Dioces, as the Dissuader talks, that ther must be then as many flocks of Christians, as there be byshops upon earth; which being not subordinate all of them to one general pastour, can never bring their flocks into one.

Second is, That such a polity and government must ever be preserved in Christs Church, which himself set up and practised. This is most certain. For if that polity or body be changed, it

is

is no more Christs polity or Christs body, but that other, whatever it be which is introduced in his place, and the body of that man or men that introduced it: from whence also it receivs its name; as from Luther, his followers are called Lutherans, and Calvinists from Calvin: and consequently all the laws, which do ever follow the condition of the government, must alter with it. Thus it was with us here in England the other day. When our government was changed, we were no more the body of William the Conquerour, or any polity instituted by him; but another polity or body, set up by the Rump-Parliament; and all our laws became then liable to their arbitrary interpretation, to be wrested as themselvs pleased. And they had been, if we had continued a while longer in that sad condition, by degrees utterly abolished. All this not our reason only, but heavy experience will acknowledg for a certain truth. But Christ our Lord did assuredly both set up and practise himself a visible sovereignty over all the whole flock of Christians, which he gathered together from other visible companies of Jews and Pagans. And therfor must ther still and ever be, som one visible pastour over this one flock unto the worlds end. For if that polity or body change, then is it no more Christs body, but another thing. And his laws and religion will be then interpreted according

to the pleasure of those who first rejected the government, and of their followers afterward, unto infinite and endles misery.

And that this polity or government is ever to remain in Christs Church on earth, may be gathered, first by this; That every wise legislatour knows well enough, that all his people under him look upon his example, as their rule to steer by ever after, so long as they mean to preserv his way, and be of his body. Thus, when any state is once founded either in aristocracy, democracy or monarchy, the founder of such a state has no need to tell the people, what he would have them to do afterwards; or whether they should choos themselvs one governour or many; where they have his clear example to walk by. They will naturally follow his steps therin, so long as they mean to preserv the state he has established. Now the Apostles and all his disciples and beleevers knew and saw, that the Church of Christ, which is his state spiritual, was founded by him in monarchy, or the superintendency of one over all. And therfor as soon as our Lord spoke to them of his own departure, they began all of them naturally to think of one, who should succeed in his general care, and who that one should be. Nor did they doubt, whether one should be over all the flock, but who should be that one, that should preside and oversee it. And to prevent the faction, our

Lord, as Catholik tradition teaches, and the letter of the Gospel not obscurely insinuates, pointed out one, giving him withall a good rule of humility and charity to remain for after ages, *That he that is greatest among them should be as the least*, most humble, most serveable, most full of observance and charity: which rule if that chief pastour observ not, he is the more to blame. And all ages have ever looked upon the successour of that chief apostle, as Vicegerent of our Lord and master; under whom they are united in one flock, and so keep their laws and religion still one, and intirely the the same, from age to age; however they lye divided in place and time under several byshops up and down the world. Wheras all others besides this one Catholik flock, run into several bodies; and by their various interpretations, dissolv by little and little, according as themselvs increas, all the whole frame of ancient religion. Secondly, it may be gathered by this, that Christ our Lord instituted a monarchical government of his Church, ruled so long as he lived by one; and therfor must that government ever remain. He set it up to remain. For surely he did not set it up to be pulled down again. Thirdly, becaus there is no power on earth to change it. What God has constituted, man cannot undo, lawfully I mean he cannot.

Now

Now we have no ſuch body of Chriſtians in England, that remain under one who is general paſtour over all the Chriſtian flock in the world, or do ſo much as pretend it, ſave only the few Roman Catholiks, that are yet here left alive, by the ſtrange providence of that God, unto whoſe univerſal Church they have ſtill adhered, notwithſtanding the greateſt trials that ever poor Chriſtians were put to. Neither Quaker, Anabaptiſt, or Independent, Presbyterian or Prelate-Proteſtant do ſo much as pretend to any ſuch thing; but they all oppoſe it. And as they do not pretend to belong to any general body, that hath a viſible head overſeeing the whole flock of Chriſt throughout the world; ſo neither is any of their Church-governments monarchical in their reſpective place, if we may beleev themſelvs. I know our Engliſh Proteſtant Church was firſt appointed in the dayes of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth to be reſpectively monarchical, that is to ſay, within the precincts of this Kingdom, the hierarchy ending in the Kings majeſty, who is doubtles the ſupream head and governour both of the Proteſtant Church and the temporal or civil ſtate, in all theſe his three Kingdoms. But indeed and truth none of them acknowledg it. For they do not, any of them, expect, as they ought all of them to do, a full deciſive ſentence from the Kings Majeſties lips

in

in all their controverſies or doubts of faith; nor will they acquieſce in his judgment: which is a ſtrange mad refractorines in our nation, and contrary to our own principles. The Independents laſt tribunal is in the light of his own breaſt. The Presbyterian will not look beyond his Presbyteral Conſiſtory. And the Prelate-Proteſtant writer, which I moſt marvel at, ends all in the byſhops, allowing no autority, power or juriſdiction to their Archbyſhops, but only an order and decent precedency for manners ſake, which in effect is wholly to diſſolve the conſtituted frame of Church-government in this land. They ſpeak not indeed of the Kings majeſty, for fear I ſuppoſe of the rod God hath put into his hands. But it is not hard to gather both by their words and actions, what they think. Whitby of late wrote a book againſt Dean Creſſy; and there he ſayes expeſly, that an Arch-byſhop *hath a decent precedency, but no authority*; and that his *Grace of Canterbury hath no juriſdiction*; and that the Kings Majeſty is not the root of Epiſcopal juriſdiction here in England: And yet he was approved and praiſed even by our Proteſtant byſhops. Do they not ſee, that *à pari*, nay *à fortiori* the ſame be affirmed of our byſhops? that they have no autority, and that they have but a decent precedency over Presbyters, and that they are not the root of eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction. With what a ſtrange

ſtrange blindnes are our eyes poſſeſt? Nay, this great Diſſwader an eminent man among Prelate-Proteſtants, here teaches publickly, *that byſhops are all ſupream under Chriſt.* So that this our Church-government by byſhops, can be no other but Ariſtocracy: the Presbyterians a Democracy; and the reſt a plain Anarchy, every man thinking and acting what is good in his own eyes. And none of theſe, who are all fallen from the general flock and general paſtour, heed unto effect, any one thing that may reſtrain them, either ſtatutes, canons, laws, conſtitutions, or ought els. But God bleſſes his true Church with a true obedience. Thus I have given you Sir my reaſon, why I think ther is and muſt be one general paſtour over all the whole flock of Chriſtians. Pray ponder it well. Brief I am in it, becaus it is beyond my general deſign, which is only to ſhew, that Doctour Taylors Diſſwaſive from Popery is inſignificant.

I am now come to the teſtimonies your Diſſwader cites for himſelf; which I told you before, are above half of them impertinent, and the reſt; if he had not fraudulently maimed them, flatly againſt himſelf. As for the firſt ſort, your Diſſwader imagining in his head, that the Apoſtles had no ſuperiour, which is the grand falſity on which all his whole diſcours runs, brings all thoſe authors who either ſay,

that

that *byshops are the successours of the Apostles*; or that they had *received the keyes of heaven*; or that *they are not to be contemned*, and the like, for witnesses of his opinion, as Irenæus, Cyprian, Ambrose, Anacletus, Clemens, Hieronimus, Gregorius, and various others. All this is impertinent. But the other autorities, had they not been curtaild and perverted by him, had openly and plainly spoken that Catholik truth, which he here opposes; namely that the *Apostles had a superiour*; and that all *the whole Christian flock have and ought to have one general pastour*, and that *he ever hitherto hath sate since S. Peters death in the Roman See.* I know it would be worth my labour to set down all those testimonies by him here cited, at large as they lye in those Catholik Fathers and Divines: as apt at one and the same time to convince this his whole section of falsity, and the Catholik doctrin to be no novelty, as he sayes it is. But becaus this is already done by the above-named Catholik Gentlemen, who with a greater patience than I am master of, turned over those many ancient authours, I will content my self with only the first of them.

In the whole new testament, saith your Disswader, *ther is no act or sign of superiority; or that one apostle exercised power over another; but to them whom Christ sent, he in common intrusted the Church of God, according to that excellent saying*

ing of S. Cyprian, the other apoſtles are the ſame that S. Peter was, indowed with an equal fellowſhip of honour and power, &c.

This then is the excellent ſaying of S. Cyprian, *The other apoſtles are the ſame that St. Peter was, indowed with an equal fellowſhip of honour and power.* And he cites it out of *his epiſtle de unit. Eccleſiæ ad Novatian.* But did S. Cyprian either ſay or mean by that ſaying, ſo much of it as is S. Cyprians, that ther was no ſuperiority among the apoſtles, or that the Church of God was intruſted to them in common? Nay, does not S Cyprian uſe thoſe words in a diſcours wherin he endeavours induſtriouſly to declare, that there was a ſuperiority among the Apoſtles; in which as in a cone of unity they were all united, although they were all alike in power and commiſſion of adminiſtring Sacraments. If it be ſo, what ſhall we think of this Diſſwader, and of his excellent ſaying of S. Cyprian, to prove that the Church was intruſted to the apoſtles in common; and that no one apoſtle exerciſed a power over another. The text of S. Cyprian runs thus. *Our Lord ſaid to Peter, Upon this rock will I build my Church, and again feed thou my ſheep. Upon the one Him Chriſt builds his Church, and unto Him he commends his ſheep to be fed. And although after his reſurrection he gave to all his apoſtles equal power, and ſaid, as my father ſent me, ſo I ſend you; yet that he might manifeſt unity, he*

he constituted one chair, and by his authority disposed the origen of unity beginning from one. The other apostles are the same that Peter was, &c. But the beginning comes from unity, the primacy is given to Peter, that one Church of Christ and one flock of Christ may be monstrated. Thus St. Cyprian testifies of the apostles, that although they were all equal in their spiritual commission of Gods word and Sacraments, yet were they brought to an unity by the government of one superiour, and one chair which oversaw them all. And is this a fit place to prove, that the Apostles had no superiour over them, which expressly testifies that they had one? In the same manner doth our Dissuader deal with the other testimonies. But I have been too long upon this point. Here is enough Sir to let you see, what I said in the beginning of this discours, that your Dissuaders reasons are senceles, his testimonies either impertinent or manifestly against himself, and his whole talk and doctrin contrary to the laws and constitutions of our own Protestant English Church.

§. 11. *Which concludes the novelties.*

"Gives notice of nine other popish novel-
"ties, Saints invocation, Scripture-insufficien-
"cy, absolution before pennance, Priests con-
"firmation, nine-penny-masses, circumgestation
"of Eucharist, intention in Sacraments, mass-
"sacrifice, and communionless mass.

After your Diſſwader has mentioned theſe to ſhow the fertility of his brain, he ſayes nothing of them at all, but only that *they be alſo innovations*; and thence concluds, that the Roman Religion is neither *old nor primitive nor catholik*, and that it is *eaſier for Proteſtants to tell where their religion was before Luther, then for Papiſts to tell where their religion was before Trent.* And that when *the enemy had ſowed theſe tares, and honeſt men in the Church durſt not complain, then England and other nations by the glaſs of Scriptur reformed to pure antiquity, preferring a new cure before an old ſore.* In the beginning of the ſection it was a new ſore, in the end it is an old ſore, ſo long time was he a writing this one no-ſection. And he has ſo ordered the buſines, that it will be hard now for Papiſts to ſhow their Religion before Trent, although he has neither deduced the original of theſe nine or his other ten novelties from Trent, nor can ever ſhow that theſe or they are the Papiſts religion. For as he has handled them, ther is not one of them any part of their Religion; much leſs doth their religion conſiſt in them. His firſt buſines of the power of making articles (ſect. 1.) is ſo far from religion, that it is not ſo much as the philoſophy of any one ſchool in the Catholik world. His leaſh of new articles, (ſect. 2.) is partly a fond dream, and partly an erroneous viſion of his own. His diſcours of

Indul-

Indulgences (sect. 3.) is utterly besides the purpos; and what ther is of Catholik faith in it, he allows himself as ancient. 4. His talk of Purgatory is so ridiculously absurd, that granting all that Roman faith teaches, to be both ancient and universal; he yet sayes at random, that Roman faith is not that, and yet never speaks himself what that Roman faith is. 5. In Transubstantiation he wholly playes with the word, which he knows when it came in, wholly neglecting the thing it self; and brings a multitude of Popish Doctours that own it not for their faith, and not any one popish man or woman that own it: he sayes it was defined in the Lateran Councel first; and yet is not that which was defined in the Latèran Councel, and never speaks what this thing is, which notwithstanding he will have called Popery. 6. The busines of half-communion, as he calls it, is no Popery at all, that is to say, no Catholik faith, but a custom only in the exercise of their religion, and that neither universal for time or place. And although Catholiks beleev, that it is not necessary to communicate in both kinds, yet do they not beleev, that it is necessary to communicate only in one kind, either this kind or that; but have used all the three wayes. 7. His discours about service in an unknown tongue is a like mistake, taking custom for religion, and discipline for doctrin; and he perverts and

falsifies the custom too, saying that Papists understand not their own prayers, nor know what they ask of God. 8. His talk of images passes by all the use of them that religion requires, and is wholly taken up in some school disputes and his own lies. 9. His exceptions against the pictures of the Trinity with so many eyes and noses and faces in a knot, is as much popery as *Euclids* book *de Triangulis*. 10. His section about the sovereignty of one byshop over all Christians had been about popery and catholik religion indeed, if he had handled it right; but as his reasons are fond, and autorities fals; so he mistakes the very thing it self, imagining that papists beleev that spiritual supremacy to be tied to the walls of Rome, which is no faith of theirs, and consequently none of their popery. And so none of his sections, nor any part of his discours touches either all or any part of Papists religion. And is not this a doughty piece of work to prove popery, by which all his readers understand the Roman Catholik religion, to be neither old, nor primitive, nor apostolical? How he would have handled the other nine points, becaus he says nothing of them, I will not trouble my self to read. But I am sure that seven of the nine have not any relation to Catholik religion; all of them I mean besides *Saints invocation* and the *Sacrifice of the Mass*. What Councel hath determined, or what Catholik beleevs, that

the

the sacred scripture is insufficient; or that absolution ought to be given before pennance; or that single priests are to confirm; or that masses are to be sold for nine pence; or circumgestation; or any such intention in sacraments as to damn folks, which the Diſſwader here speaks; or that mass is to be without communion. And I may now think, if he had spoke of the other two, *Saints invocation* and *Sacrifice*, he would even there also have mistaken and strayed. For he has so behaved himself hitherto, as though he were resolved not to speak any one word true or to the purpos. And yet he would seem to do it, perhaps on the same motive, that Sir *Toby Matthews* flitted from the richer bysshoprick of Durham, to that of York, *becaus*, as he himself gave the reason, *he wanted Grace*. But Doctor *Taylor* must remember his own doctrin, that an Archbysshop, although he have *Grace*, yet he has no *jurisdiction* with it: and it is a question whether is better, to have power without grace, or grace without power. He is well enough as he is, if he could be content. But ambition and covetousnes will know no bounds.

And as your Doctor in this his Diſſwasive prattles about a Popery which is no part of Catholik religion; so does he wholly pass by their chief religion, which is in a manner their whole popery; and all their religious customs attending it; not that only which the first reformers

allowed of; as their faith of one God, all powerfull, most wise and good, who made all things visible and invisible, and by his providence conserves them in their being, who in the fulnes of time sent his beloved son to reconcile the world to himself, &c. but that also which they rejected and principally inveighed against: its first internal sanctification and renovation of our spirits; which was the end of Christs appearing in the world, the efficacy of his grace in our hearts, and the intention of his counsels and laws: secondly, the comfort, merit and necessity of good works, unto which holy gospel by all sweet promises invites us, Gods holy spirit moves, the very excellency of mans nature and condition suggests, the name and profession of Christian calls for, and future happines requires. These by the first Protestants were all cried down as mortal sins, and of no value at all in the eyes of God; by which doctrins they debauched mankind, and made men so dissolute, careless and licentious, that if good nature, right reason, and the gracious working of God in our hearts had not more force upon some, than the principles of the first Protestancy, earth had become a meer hell by this. Thirdly, he passes by the priesthood, altar and sacrifice, which Christ our Lord instituted for our daily atonement in the figuration of his holy passion; at which old Christians with all fear and reverence offered up

their

their daily praiſes, requeſts, and ſupplications to God, for themſelves and allies and whole Church of Chriſt; for all diſtreſſed perſons, for kings and princes, and for all men, that we may lead a quiet and godly life in this world. Fourthly, the ſeven ſacraments of Chriſts; which are ſo many conduits of ſanctification for our ſeveral neceſſities, and for all conditions of men, and for all degrees of ſpiritual comforts. Fifthly, the obligations of vows, which any ſhall freely make for Gods glory and his own advancement, in piety, in continency, in charity; and the bleſſed condition of ſinging and praiſing God in monaſtical retirement. Sixtly, the communion and union of the whole body of Chriſtians under one viſible paſtor; by whom they are aptly knit and compaginated together into one flock and body of Chriſt; however they may differ otherwis in countrey, language, laws, civil government, and other affections. Sevently, the marks of the true Church, and the autority ſhe hath to keep her people in unity of faith and obſervance of their Chriſtian duties. Eightly, the danger of original ſin and actual tranſgreſſions; which, however we may have heard of Chriſtian faith, and beleev it to be true, may notwithſtanding exclude us eternally from the bliſs of heaven now opened to beleevers, ſuch, as by mortifying ungodly luſts ſhall render themſelves conformable to their Lord and head, who is aſcended

into heaven, and gone before to prepare there a place for them in bliss with himself. Ninthly, the necessary concurrence of Gods grace and mans will unto his justification, and sanctity and future glory in him; *Qui creavit te sine te, non salvabit te sine te*, as good S. *Austin* speaks. Tenthly, the necessity and great benefit of prayer, alms-deeds and fasting, which is practised in the Catholik Church, and commended to all as worthy fruits of that religion, which labours to root out, pride of life, concupiscence of eyes and concupiscence of flesh thereby: and our obligation to exact justice in all our contracts and dealings with our neighbour. Eleventhly, the danger of living and dying in sin to such as profess Christianity, and uselesnes of faith without the good works of grace attending it. Twelftly, the possibility of keeping Gods commandments with the assistance of his grace. Lastly, not to mention more, the great duty incumbent upon all Christians, when, led away by the deceit of Satan, flesh and this wicked world they shall chance to have strayed from their holy rule, to set all streight again by humble confession, restitution and other penal satisfactions for their fault. These and such like principles of ancient Christianity, our first reforming Protestants, *Luther* and *Calvin* with other their companions, all apostate priests from the mother Church, so stifly cryed down as notorious popery, that they

have

have thereby corrupted the whole world. But your Doctour in this your Diſſwaſive from Popery, for reaſons beſt known to himſelf, takes no notice of them at all. Proteſtant writers, however loth to practiſe them, yet aſhamed they are now to ſpeak againſt good works, as their fore-fathers did. Indeed every one of them that upon the hope of a richer benefice writes againſt Catholik Religion, makes both a new Popery, and a new Proteſtancy too; and while they ſpeak in general againſt that, they may ſay in particular of this, what they pleas. For Proteſtants had never any Councel to make them all agree, how much of Popery they ſhould reject, or what they ſhould poſitively eſtabliſh: nor ever will nor can have; nor do they care, ſo they keep but their livings and places that they have extorted from Catholik hands, which they know they cannot keep, except by libelling againſt Popery they get the power of the land, honeſter and better men then themſelvs to back and ſupport them in their wayes, whether any thing be ever ſettled or no.

I ſhould alſo here ſet down the ſubſtantial cuſtoms of Catholik Chriſtians, in their chappels and churches, oratories, and private houſes, wholly neglected by the Diſſwader, though they be in the hearts and hands of them all throughout the whole earth. If he had declared either their ſubſtantial faith or cuſtoms, he had loſt his

his credit with some, but he had saved his own soul, which now is becom as black as hell with slaunders, lyes, and uncharitable depravations both of their customs and immaculate Religion. What he can pervert and make sport with, that he puts upon them for popery; and what he cannot, that must be thought no popery at all. But this I cannot now insist upon. My letter is already grown too long.

AND yet I cannot but give you notice Sir, that even these things specified here by your Disswader for popish novelties, as they are rightly understood in the catholik sence and meaning; Indulgences; the real presence, under the apperances or species of material symbols; Communion in one kind, Liturgy in hebrew, greek or latin tongus, unknown generally to vulgar people; Use and respect of images and sacred figures; Spiritual Supremcay in one byshop over the rest; Saints invocation, and sacrifice of mass, are all acknowledged by former Protestant Reformers, for old errours, errours indeed but old, very old ones, a thousand years older than your Disswader makes them, who would here make us beleev they are but fresh novelties.

As for the antiquity of Indulgences, so far as they belong to Catholik beleef, I need not trouble my self with further testimonies, then

the only one of your Diſſwader himſelf, who is *inſtar omnium*. For p. 17. he acknowledges their uſe to be *ancient and primitive*.

As for the real preſence, Humpred in his Jeſuitiſm ſayes, *that Gregory the great*, who lived a thouſand years ago, *taught Tranſubſtantiation*. The Century writers Cent. 5. teach, that *Chryſoſtom*, who was two hundred years before Gregory, *it thought to confirm tranſubſtantiation*: and Cent. 4. they place under the title *of hurtful opinions and errours of the fathers*, that ſaying of S. Greg. Nyſſen in his catechiſt ſermon de divino ſacramento, *Not becaus it is eaten doth the bread becom the body of the word, but forthwith by the word it is changed into the body, as it is ſaid by the word, This is my body*. And they ſay in the ſame century c. 10. *That Euſebius, Emiſſenus did ſpeak unprofitably of Tranſubſtantiation*. Antony de Adamo in his anotomy of the maſs ſayes, *That the book of Sacraments aſcribed to Ambroſe affirms the opinion of Chriſts bodily preſence in the ſacrament*. Peter Martyr in his defence, wholly *diſlikes the judgment of St. Cyril in this point*. Mr. Whitgift in his defence againſt Cartwright, teſtifies of St. Ignatius diſciple to St. John the Evangeliſt, that he ſhould ſay of ſome hereticks in his time, *That they do not admit Euchariſts and oblations, becaus they confeſs not the Euchariſt to be the fleſh of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, which fleſh ſuffered for our ſins*, Adamus Franciſci

in

in his margarita theologica, saith, *Commentum papistarum de transubstantiatione maturè in ecclesiam irrepsit.* And Antony de Adamo in his anatomy of the Mass, saith, *I have not yet hitherto been able to know, when this opinion of the real and bodily being of Christ in the Sacrament did begin.* This then according to the acknowledgment of Protestants and those very learned men, is no novelty.

The indifferency of communion either in one kind or both is manifestly affirmed by Luther in his epistle ad Bohemos, by Melanchton in his century of theological epistles, and several other Protestants, convinced therof by the current of primitive antiquity.

That the Christian Liturgy was in ancient times ever celebrated in Greek, Chaldee, Latin or other language unknown to vulgar Christians, and in a part of the Church where lay people might not approach, and great part of it secretly, and out of the hearing of any body, and with much pomp of vestments, gold and silver chalices, &c. is amply testified by Theodore Beza, in his eight epistle theological. And therfor Queen Elizabeth did not think she acted against antiquity, when she caused the Service to be read in English all over Wales, where the people understand it not. For which very same reason the great Cardinal Richlieu deservedly taxed heretical ministers (who except

cept, at least in outward show, against this ancient custom) for their practising the very same thing; (as convinced in their own consciences that it was the ancient practice) both in *Bearn*, *Narbo*, *Province*, and other places, where the ministers of those places read Service in the French Tongue, which was not the language of those Provinces, nor by any of those people any more understood, than is Latin by the vulgar of mankind. And yet the case is far otherwise in this affair affair amongst Catholiks than other people. For these do but only come together to hear and attend to the Minister what he sayes. But the Priests in the Catholik Church comes to make atonement for the people: which may well be done, so long as the said people are in a general disposition of heart fitly disposed to present themselvs before the face of their Lord for that end, whether they hear and know the sighs and requests of their petitioner in particular for them or no, so long as they are assured they are of that true Church, by whom their priests are directed in their duty. For thus it was in the law of Moyses dictated by God himself. *There shall be no man*, saith the sacred text, Lev. 16. *in the tabernacle of the congregation, when the priest goeth in to make an atonment in the holy place, untill he come out and have made an atonement for himself and for his houshold, and for all the congregation of Israel.* If God allowed

of

of this custom four thousand years ago, it can neither be a novelty nor ill.

As for images and their due respect, the Magdeburgian Centuriators in their 4. Century testifie, *That Lactantius affirms many superstitious things concerning the efficacy of Christs image.* And in their 8. century, *That S. Bede erred in the worshipping of images.* So Bale in his pageant of Popes sayes, *That Gregory by his indulgences established pilgrimages to images, and defended worshipping of images.* As also, *That S. Leo allowed the worshipping of Images.* Functius another Protestant in his chronology at 494. addes, *That Xenaias who lived thirteen hundred years ago, was specially noted and condemned for being the first that stirred up wars against images.* This is then no novelty neither.

As for Purgatory and prayer for the dead, Fulk in his Retentive affirms, *That it prevailed within three hundred years after Christ.* And in his confutation of Purgatory, *That Ambrose allowed prayer for the dead, and that it was the common errour of his time.* And again in the same book, *That Chrysostom and Jerom allowed prayer for the dead:* and in another place of the same book, *That Austin blindly defended it:* and again there, *That Tertullian, Cyprian, Austin, Jerom, and many others affirm, that sacrifice for the dead is the tradition of the Apostles.* As also he had acknowledged about ten pages before, in the same book,

book, *That prayers for the dead is taught in the writings now extant under the name of Dionysius Areopagita*, mentioned in the acts of the Apostles, which book, though he doubt whether it be his or no, yet himself writing against the Rhemish upon the 2. Thessalonians, allows *it to have been written above thirteen hundred years ago.* Chemnitius in his Examen sayes, *That it was taught by Austin, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom:* as nine pages before that, he had said, *It was taught by Origen, Ambrose, Prudentius and Jerom.* Mr. George Gifford in his Demonstration sayes, *That it was generally in the Church long before Austin, as may be seen in Cyprian and Tertullian.* And Bucer in his Enarrations upon the Gospels speaks, *That prayer and alms were made for the dead almost from the very beginning of the Church.* This is not a novelty then.

As for Papal Superiority, the Protestant Centuriators acknowledg, *That in the fist age of the Church*, above a thousand years ago, *the Roman Bishops applyed themselves to establish dominion over other Churches*; and, *That they usurped to themselves right of granting priviledges and ornaments to other Archbyshops*: and, *That they confirmed Archbyshops in their Sees*: and, *That they deposed and excommunicated some, and absolved others*: That *they arrogated power to themselves of citing other Archbyshops to declare their cans before them*: That *against a byshop appealing to the*

Apo-

Apoſtolick See, nothing ſhould be determined, but what the byſhop of Rome cenſured; That *they appointed their legates in remote Provinces, challenging autority to hear and determin all upriſing controverſies; eſpecially, in queſtions of faith:* That *they took upon them power of appointing general councels, and to preſide therein, either by themſelves or their deputies, rejecting for unlawful thoſe Synods that were called without their autority.* They alſo adde in the ſame century, *That Roman Byſhops had flatterers in thoſe times, who affirmed, that without permiſsion of the Roman byſhop none might undertake the perſon of a judge.* Nay, forgetting themſelves they averre in the ſame century, Collat. 775. *That antiquity had attributed the principality of Prieſthood to the Roman byſhop above all.* I could alledg alſo the like confeſſion of Beza, Mr. Whitgift, and Cartwright: but thoſe eminent Proteſtant Centuriators may ſerv for all, who teſtifie further in that fifth century, That *Victor called the Roman Church the head of all Churches:* That *Turbius Aſturienſis flattered Pope Leo, and acknowledged his ſuperiority:* That *ſometimes byſhops condemned in Synods appealed to the See of Rome, as did,* ſay they, *Flavianus Patriarch of Conſtantinople in the Councel of Epheſus*; and that *Councels alſo requeſted to have their acts confirmed by the byſhop of Rome.* And ſo indeed did not only Flavianus appeal to Pope Leo, but Talida Patriarch of

Alex-

Alexandria deposed by the Emperour Zeno, appealed also to Pope Simplicius; S. Athanasius to Pope Julius; &c. So did the Councel of Chalcedon request to be confirmed by Pope Leo, the Councel of Carthage by Pope Innocent, the Councel of Ephesus by Pope Celestin, &c.

The like superiority of the Roman byshop, not only over the neighbour Churches and Byshops of Italy, but over remote provinces, and the greatest Archbyshops and Patriarks of the world is acknowledged by Protestants to have been practised also before that, in the fourth age, when the Church first lift up her head by favour of Constantine the great, and appeared openly in the world. In this age say the Centuriators, *the mystery of iniquity was not idle.* And they say also, that then *the byshop of Rome challenged by ecclesiastical canon, the disallowing of those Synods whereat they were absent*; That *Theodoret* a greek father, who lived about the latter end of this age, *deposed by the Councel of Ephesus, was restored to his byshoprick by Pope Leo, unto whom he had made his appeal*; and that *S. Chrysostom appealed likewise to Pope Innocentius, who thereupon decreed his adversary Theophilus to be excommunicated and deposed*: That the famous and *ancient Councel of Sardis*, consisting of above 300 byshops assembled from Spain, France, Italy, Sardinia, Greece, Egypt, The-

bais, Lybia, Paleſtin, Arabia, and ſundry other places of the world, and wherat ſundry fathers of the Nicen Councel were preſent, *decreed appeals to the byſhop of Rome*: for which fact *the Centuriators blame the ſaid councel*; as do alſo Oſiander, Calvin, Peter Martyr and others. And laſtly, that wheras the Arrians had expelled Athanaſius byſhop of Alexandria, Paulus byſhop of Conſtantinople, and other Catholick byſhops of the Eaſt, and brought their accuſation to Julius then byſhop of Rome, that he might ratifie what they had done; he, the ſaid byſhop *ſummoned Athanaſius according to the canons, and when he had heard all ſides ſpeak, he reſtored Athanaſius and his fellow byſhops to their own place*; *fretus eccleſiæ Romanæ prærogativa*, as the Centuriſts there ſpeak.

In the age before this, when raging perſecution obſcured both the government and moſt of the written monuments of that time, yet want there not monuments of the Popes power in confirming, depoſing, reſtoring byſhops. Then it was, that S. Cyprian, as himſelf teſtifies, moved Pope Stephen, by his letters to depoſe Martianus from his byſhoprick, and appoint another in his place; and he tells us likewiſe in his fourth epiſtle, how Baſilides went to Rome, hoping to beguile Pope Stephen then ignorant of the whole matter, ſo to procure himſelf to be reſtored to his byſhoprick, from which he had

had been justly, saith S. Cyprian, deposed. In this age the foresaid learned Centuriators *reprove Pope Stephen for his undertaking to threaten excommunication to Helenus and Firmiltanus, and all others throughout Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Asia for rebaptizing hereticks*; they reprove also, as became Protestants to do, both S. Cyprian and Tertullian in this point; Tertullian for saying, *that the keyes were committed to S. Peter, and the Church built on him*; S. Cyprian, for affirming *the Church to be built upon S. Peter, and one chair founded by our Lords voice upon the rock*; for calling *Peters chair the principal Church, from whence Priestly unity ariseth*: and for saying, *that there ought to be one byshop in the Catholik Church; and that the Roman Church ought to be acknowledged of all other for the mother and root of the Catholik Church.*

In the second age, the next after the apostles, wherof fewer monuments remain, yet be there some testimonies of this superiority acknowledged even by Protestants. Pope *Victor is owned* even by our Mr. Whitgift in his defence, *to be a godly byshop and martyr, and the Church in his time in great purity, not being long after the apostles times*; and yet Amandus Polonus a Protestant Professour at Basil sayes in his theological thesis of the same Pope Victor, *That he shewed a Papal mind and arrogancy*: and Mr. Spark in his answer against John Albines, thinks him,

somewhat Pope-like to have exceeded his bounds, when he took upon him to excommunicate the bishops of the East: and Whitaker charges him with *exercising jurisdiction upon other Churches*. So that these three Protestants discerned a papal power even in this second pure age of the Church, although they liked it not. But the Protestant Centuriators do much except against a saying of S. Irenæus, who lived in this age next after the apostles, and might well remember the apostles own lively preachings, (as Hamelmannus a Protestant writer in his book of traditions, speaks both of Irenæus and Polycarp) recorded in the third chapter of his third book, *Ad hanc enim ecclesiam Romanam, propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam*; *It is necessary, that every other Church*, saith Irenæus, *comply with the Roman, by reason of her greater principality*. First, becaus he sayes *it is necessary*; secondly, that *every Church*; thirdly, for the *Roman Church's more potent principality*, to comply with her, the Centurists are much displeased at it, and censure it for a very corrupt speech. And indeed the papal power and jurisdiction was so eminent in all ages, that Philip Nicolai in his comment de regno Christi, *refers the beginning of it to the infirmity of the Apostles, and bishops succeeding them*. For there speaking of the origin and increas of papal power, *Primatus affectatio*, saith he,

he, *communis fuit infirmitas apostolorum, ac etiam primorum urbis episcoporum.*

Finally, in the first age, that St. Peter had a primacy above the other apostles, is acknowledged by Calvin; *The twelve apostles had one among them to govern the rest*; by Musculus, *The celestial spirits are not equal, the apostles themselves were not equal, Peter is found in many places to have been chief amongst the rest, which we deny not*; by Mr. Whitgift, *Amongst the Apostles themselves ther was one chief*; and by Dr. Covel, who in his examinations, teaches at large against the Puritans, both that *there was one appointed over the rest amongst the apostles to keep them in unity*; and that *that government was not to ceas with the apostles, but ever to continue in the Church*; and that it is the *only way to prevent dissention, and suppress hereſies*; and that otherwise *the Church would be in a far wors case, than the meaneſt Commonwealth, nay almost than a den of thieves.* But the Centuriſts like not this; and therfor do they in their 4. Cent. reprehend many of the Fathers, for entituling Peter *the head of the apostles, and the byshop of byshops.* So indeed Optatus calls him *apostolorum caput*, and therfor *Cephas*; Origen *apostolorum principem*; Cyril of Jerusalem, *principem & caput caterorum*; Cyril of Alexandria, *Pastorem & caput ecclesiæ*; Arnobius *Episcoporum episcopum*; the Councel of Chalcedon, *Petram & verticem ecclesiæ Catholicæ.*

bais, Lybia, Paleſtin, Arabia, and ſundry other places of the world, and wherat ſundry fathers of the Nicen Councel were preſent, *decreed appeals to the byſhop of Rome:* for which fact *the Centuriators blame the ſaid councel*; as do alſo Oſiander, Calvin, Peter Martyr and others. And laſtly, that wheras the Arrians had expelled Athanaſius byſhop of Alexandria, Paulus byſhop of Conſtantinople, and other Catholick byſhops of the Eaſt, and brought their accuſation to Julius then byſhop of Rome, that he might ratifie what they had done, he, the ſaid byſhop *ſummoned Athanaſius according to the canons, and when he had heard all ſides ſpeak, he reſtored Athanaſius and his fellow byſhops to their own place*; *fretus eccleſiæ Romanæ prærogativa*, as the Centuriſts there ſpeak.

In the age before this, when raging perſecution obſcured both the government and moſt of the written monuments of that time, yet want there not monuments of the Popes power in confirming, depoſing, reſtoring byſhops. Then it was, that S. Cyprian, as himſelf teſtifies, moved Pope Stephen, by his letters to depoſe Martianus from his byſhoprick, and appoint another in his place; and he tells us likewiſe in his fourth epiſtle, how Baſilides went to Rome, hoping to beguile Pope Stephen then ignorant of the whole matter, ſo to procure himſelf to be reſtored to his byſhoprick, from which he had

had been justly, saith S. Cyprian, deposed. In this age the foresaid learned Centuriators *reprove Pope Stephen for his undertaking to threaten excommunication to Helenus and Firmiltanus, and all others throughout Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Asia for rebaptizing hereticks*; they reprove also, as became Protestants to do, both S. Cyprian and Tertullian in this point; Tertullian for saying, *that the keyes were committed to S. Peter, and the Church built on him*; S. Cyprian, for affirming *the Church to be built upon S. Peter, and one chair founded by our Lords voice upon the rock*; for calling *Peters chair the principal Church, from whence Priestly unity ariseth*: and for saying, *that there ought to be one byshop in the Catholik Church*; *and that the Roman Church ought to be acknowledged of all other for the mother and root of the Catholik Church.*

In the second age, the next after the apostles, wherof fewer monuments remain, yet be there some testimonies of this superiority acknowledged even by Protestants. Pope *Victor is owned* even by our Mr. Whitgift in his defence, *to be a godly byshop and martyr, and the Church in his time in great purity, not being long after the apostles times*: and yet Amandus Polonus a Protestant Professour at Basil sayes in his theological thesis of the same Pope Victor, *That he shewed a Papal mind and arrogancy*: and Mr. Spark in his answer against John Albines, thinks him,

ſomewhat Pope-like to have exceeded his bounds, when he took upon him to excommunicate the byſhops of the Eaſt: and Whitaker charges him with *exerciſing juriſdiction upon other Churches.* So that theſe three Proteſtants diſcerned a papal power even in this ſecond pure age of the Church, although they liked it not. But the Proteſtant Centuriators do much except againſt a ſaying of S. Irenæus, who lived in this age next after the apoſtles, and might well remember the apoſtles own lively preachings, (as Hamelmannus a Proteſtant writer in his book of traditions, ſpeaks both of Irenæus and Polycarp) recorded in the third chapter of his third book, *Ad hanc enim eccleſiam Romanam, propter potentiorem principalitatem neceſſe eſt omnem convenire eccleſiam*; *It is neceſſary, that every other Church*, ſaith Irenæus, *comply with the Roman, by reaſon of her greater principality.* Firſt, becaus he ſayes *it is neceſſary*; ſecondly, that *every Church*; thirdly, for the *Roman Church's more potent principality*, to comply with her, the Centuriſts are much diſpleaſed at it, and cenſure it for a very corrupt ſpeech. And indeed the papal power and juriſdiction was ſo eminent in all ages, that Philip Nicolai in his comment de regno Chriſti, *refers the beginning of it to the infirmity of the Apoſtles, and byſhops ſucceeding them.* For there ſpeaking of the origin and increas of papal power, *Primatus affectatio*, ſaith he,

he, *communis fuit infirmitas apoſtolorum, ac etiam primorum urbis epiſcoporum.*

Finally, in the firſt age, that St. Peter had a primacy above the other apoſtles, is acknowledged by Calvin; *The twelve apoſtles had one among them to govern the reſt*; by Muſculus, *The celeſtial ſpirits are not equal, the apoſtles themſelves were not equal, Peter is found in many places to have been chief amongſt the reſt, which we deny not*; by Mr. Whitgift, *Amongſt the Apoſtles themſelves ther was one chief*; and by Dr. Covel, who in his examinations, teaches at large againſt the Puritans, both that *there was one appointed over the reſt amongſt the apoſtles to keep them in unity*; and that *that government was not to ceas with the apoſtles, but ever to continue in the Church*; and that it is the *only way to prevent diſſention, and ſuppreſs hereſies*; and that otherwiſe *the Church would be in a far wors caſe, than the meaneſt Commonwealth, nay almoſt than a den of thieves.* But the Centuriſts like not this; and therfor do they in their 4. Cent. reprehend many of the Fathers, for entituling Peter *the head of the apoſtles, and the byſhop of byſhops.* So indeed Optatus calls him *apoſtolorum caput*, and therfor *Cephas*; Origen *apoſtolorum principem*; Cyril of Jeruſalem, *principem & caput caterorum*; Cyril of Alexandria, *Paſtorem & caput eccleſiæ*; Arnobius *Epiſcoporum epiſcopum*; the Councel of Chalcedon, *Petram & verticem eccleſiæ Catholica.*

licæ. Thus much for that point; which by all this is proved to be far from any novelty.

As for Saints invocation, and the antiquity of that beleef and custom, it is acknowledged by the Centuristes, Chemnitius, our Dr. Whitgift, and Fulk. Dr. Whitgift in his defence hath these words, *Almost all the byshops and writers of the Greek Church and Latin also, for the most part were spotted with doctrins of Free-will, of merit, of invocation of Saints, and such like.* Fulk in his rejoynder to Bristow, *I confess*, saith he, *that Ambrose, Austin, and Jerom held invocation of Saints to be lawful*: and in his book against the Rhemish Testament, *In Nazianzen, Basil, and Chrysostom I confess*, saith he, *is mention of invocation of Saints*: and again, *that Theodoret also speaketh of prayers to martyrs*: and again in the same book, *that Leo ascribeth much to the prayers of S. Peter for him*: and again, *that many ancient fathers held, that Saints departed pray for us.* Chemnitius in his examen, acknowledges as much of *S. Basil, Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Theodoret, S. Jerom, and even S. Austin himself.* The Centuristes charge the same *upon S. Cyprian*, who is ancienter than S. Austin; and again *upon Origen*, who was ancienter than Cyprian: adding, that there are manifest steps of Saints invocation in the doctors of that ancient age. So, this is no novelty then.

Lastly, as for the Sacrifice of Mass, and Altars,

Altars, (which as Dr. Reynolds sayes well in his conference with Hart, are linked together) Peter Martyr in his common places, *reproveth Peter of Alexandria for attributing more*, as he speaks, *to the outward altar, than to the living temples of Christ*: and he checks *Optatus* also for saying, *what is the altar? even the seat of the body and blood of Christ*; *such sayings as these*, saith Peter Martyr, *edified not the people*; and lastly, *all the fathers in general he finds fault with, for their abusing so frequently the name Altar*; which indeed is spoken of even by S. Ignatius, the Apostles undoubted schollar, *who is therfor carped at* by Cartwright. Calvin, Fulk, and Field acknowledg, *that most ancient fathers, S. Athanasius, Ambrose, Austin, Arnobius, talked much of the Christian Sacrifice and Altar, and Priests, who offer and pour out daily on the holy table*; *adding, that the fathers without doubt received that their doctrin from the Jews and Gentiles whom therin they imitated.* The Centuriators in 3. Cent. *blame Cyprian as superstitious in that point*; and in their 2 Cent. say, *that S. Irenæus and Ignatius though disciples of the apostles, were dangerously erroneous in that account.* Sebastianus Francus in his epistle *de abrogandis in universum omnibus statutis ecclesiasticis* affirms, that *presently after the apostles times, the supper of our Lord was turned into a sacrifice*, Andreas Chrastovius in his book *de opificio missæ*, *charges the most ancient fathers with using a propitiatory*

ſacrifice. And our own Aſcham in his *Apologet. pro cœna Domini,* is found to acknowledg, *that ſacrifice for the dead and living is ſo ancient in the Chriſtian Church, that no beginning of it can be found:* although he thinks alſo with Calvin, that it was derived, whenſoever it firſt began, from the cuſtom either of the Jews or Gentiles, or both; thus beſpattering with his raſh pen the very firſt ſproutings of Chriſtianity in the world. However it is in the mean time no novelty at leaſt.

And let any one in any age of Chriſtianity look all over the Chriſtian world, on any of thoſe who profeſs that name, whether they kept communion with the Roman Church, or brake by ſchiſme from it, or perhaps never heard of it, as they ſay the Church in Ethiopia did not, and he ſhall find that they all had this Chriſtian ſacrifice amongſt them, as the great capital work of their Religion. The *Grecians* under their Patriarch of Conſtantinople even ſtill after their ſchiſme have their Prieſts celebrating in all their ancient robes this their ſacred liturgy to this day in the learned greek tongue all over the world where they live, and may ſerv God, not only in Greece, Epirus, Macedon and iſlands of the Egœan ſea, but in many parts of Natolia, Circaſſia, Ruſſia, Thrace, Bulgaria, Raſcia, Servia, Boſnia, Walachia, Moldavia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Thracia, and up as far North as Trebiſond.

biſond. The *Aſſyrians* or *Melchites*, who are under the Archbyſhop of Damaſcus, whom they intitle Patriarch of Antioch: The *Georgians* that dwell between the Euxin and Caſpian ſeas, under their Metropolitan who reſides in the monaſtery of S. Catherin in Mount Sinai. The *Circaſsians* that live between them and the river Tanais: The *Muſcovites* or *Ruſsians*, under the primate of Moſco: The *Neſtorians* diſperſed up and down in Aſſyria, Meſopotamia, Parthia, Media even to Cataia and India, under their Patriarch reſiding either in Muzal, or the monaſtery of S. Ermes faſt by it. The *Indians* or *Chriſtians of S. Thomas*, about the cities of Coulan and Maliapar, Angamal and Cochin under their own archbyſhop, who is ſubject to the patriark of Muzal, or patriark of Babylon, as they call him: The *Jacobites* in Cyprus, Syria, Meſopotamia, and Paleſtin, under their patriark reſident in Caramit metropolis of Meſopotamia, or els in the monaſtery of S. Saphran near the city Merdin: The *Cophti*, or Chriſtians of Egypt, ſubject to the patriark of Alexandria: The *Habaſins* or midland Ethiopians under their own patriark or *Abuna*, who is ever a monk of S. Antonies order, conſecrated for them by the patriark of Alexandria: The *Armenians*, on this ſide and beyond Euphrates, under their two patriarks, reſident, one of them in Mitilene, or els in the city of Sis, not far

far from Tarſus in Cilicia, the other in Sebaſtia, or els in the monaſtery of Ecmeazin: The *Maronites* reſident in mount Libanus, under their patriark, who is ever a monk, and reſides either in Tripoli, or in the great monaſtery of S. Antony: All theſe, although many of them fell away long ſince from eccleſiaſtick unity upon their diſlike of the Councel of Epheſus and Chalcedon, where one perſon and two natures in Chriſt was declared, and others of them upon other ſuch like occaſion, yet do they ſtill keep up all of them, their monaſteries, altars, prieſthood, ſacred ordination, meſſach, and ancient Chriſtian Liturgy. Nor do they know any other way of ſerving or appeaſing the Almighty in order to heavenly bliſs, than this propiatory ſacrifice, which received from their forefathers they practiſe and exerciſe to this day. And this was ever the great devotion of all Chriſtians, and ſtill is, excepting only ſome few here in the North who have gone out of that primitive Chriſtianity, the laſt age, by following the unhappy ſteps of Luther and Calvin; and not all of them neither. For Luther, although he fouled, yet did he not throw down the altar: and the pure Lutherans that be yet in Germany, Denmark and Sweathland, keep it up ſtill.

Thus Sir have other Proteſtants admitted all that to be ancient, which this your Diſſwader calls

calls a novelty unheard of in ancient times. Nay Luther and Calvin eſteemed all Popery an old Egyptian darknes ſpread over the face of the Church all ages ſince the Apoſtles dayes, and diſſipated at length by that new light which they revealed. It is a ſtrange thing that Popery which in Luther and Calvins dayes was old, ſhould now after a hundred years be grown young again. But when Proteſtancy was new, then Popery was old; and now Popery muſt be thought new, when Proteſtancy is grown old and rotten. Truth is, it was the Miniſters advantage, to acknowledg Popery to be old, when and where Catholik Religion ſpread all over the earth, had all her monuments intire by her, to ſhow her antiquity to all people then living; who had alſo heard of the Catholik faith of their anceſtours; although they made it by ſlight of fallacious oratory erroneous. But here and now in England, where all thoſe monuments are deſtroyed, it is a double convenience to ſay, that Popery is erroneous and new too. When the firſt Reformers endeavoured to ſupplant the Catholik profeſſours of their means and livings, it was beſt to accuſe them of old errours. But now to keep their livings they have invaded, it is a wiſer part it ſeems, to inveigh againſt Popery as a novelty. There novelty could no way be proved; and here in England antiquity cannot eaſily be ſhown.

Then

Then matter of fact would have disproved novelty; now matter of fact will not prove antiquity here in this Kingdom, where the ancient religion is abrogated about a hundred years ago; and people now alive that behold Protestancy, never saw Catholick Religion, and are almost perswaded by their ministers there was never any such thing here. Nor will people read Catholik authors, nor beleev them if they do; nor have they power to consider who built all their Churches, or made their laws, or any other good thing done for them by Catholik beleevers, but take all Papists to be in a manner Atheists, becaus they com not to hear their ministers talk in those Churches from whence poor Catholiks were first solemnly banisht; and then within a while after were punished for not coming there; at such a time, when their altar, sacrifice and priesthood were now abolished, and their priests put to death, and others made liable to it afterwards, when ever they should come into those Churches again to do their functions; and ministers had got into their places to rail against them and that holy ancient Religion, which had built those Churches to their hands.

Ther is I think no better way imaginable to discover the natur of the ancient Christian Church, than by considering what was said to be her beleef and practice then, when first she dared

dared to ſhow her face openly in the world, appearing at length as it were from under ground and her former lurking condition, wherin ſhe had remained three hundred years under the cruel perſecution of Pagan Emperours. As ſoon as Conſtantin the Great, Gods heavenly grace ſo moving him, had firſt taken this holy Church by the hand, and cloathed her with her ornaments of peace, then ſurely ſhe would appear her ſelf. And what ſhe was then, may be eaſily gathered by ſuch ancient writers, who either purpoſely ſpake of the life of Conſtantin, or incidentally of the things which were done in thoſe dayes, as Euſebius, Zozomen, S. Jerom, Bede, and others; who deliver us the form and features of the Chriſtian Church in thoſe times, ſo like unto the Popery that is now adayes, after thirteen or fourteen hundred years, both in the particulars Dr. Taylor ſpeaks of, and ſeveral others now cancelled by our Proteſtant Reformation; that a man may ſafely ſwear, that the now preſent Popery and old Chriſtianity are one and the ſame thing.

Euſebius tells us, how Conſtantin the Emperour after the faſhion of thoſe good times, chaſtiſed his own body with faſting and diſciplines; how he uſed to bleſs himſelf, and ſign his face with the ſign of the Croſs; how highly he honoured and ſet up that triumphal enſign,

ſign, having confidence of victory in vertue therof; how he erected illuſtrious temples in memory of the Chriſtian martyrs; how he refuſed to ſit down in the general Councel of Nice, till the Prelates there had given their conſent; how he dedicated a ſumptuous Church in memory of the apoſtles, and provided there a ſepulchre for himſelf, to the end that after his death he might be partaker of the prayers there offered; how he aſſembled the prieſts to the dedication of his temple, wherof ſome preached, others offered ſacrifice for the common peace, for the Church of God, and for the Emperour; and laſtly how in his ſickneſs he confeſt his ſins in a chappel of the martyrs, and prayer and ſacrifice made for his ſoul after his deceas.

Zozomen in his hiſtory tells us alſo of him, that becaus thoſe primitive Chriſtians uſed conſecrated places, and only them for their publick Liturgy, Conſtantin had ever carried with him in the camp a portable altar and tabernacle, and prieſts and deacons attending it, for celebration of divine myſteries; how much alſo he honoured the holy monk S. Anthony for the great auſterities of his life; how he would have all conciliar deciſions to be regarded as moſt firm and unalterable; and that he would not undertake the judgment of eccleſiaſtical cauſes; and that he had great veneration for the

the ſign of the Croſs. Theſe and ſuch like things ſpeaks Zozomen.

So likewis, that Churches and Altars were conſecrated in the time of Conſtantin the Great, with the ſign of the Croſs and ſprinkling of holy water amongſt other Catholik rites and ceremonies, is witneſſed by S. Auſtin and S. Bede. That Conſtatin the Emperour tranſlated to Conſtantinople the holy reliques of S. Andrew, S. Luke, and S. Timothy, at which the devils even audibly yelled and roared out, is aſſerted by S. Jerom. That the Emperour in all his glory went to kiſs the Martyrs Sepulchres, humbly praying thoſe Saints, that they would be interceſſours to God for him, is told us by S. Chryſoſtom. And laſtly, that in Conſtantins dayes the Popes authority was acknowledged and reverenced, is apparent by the great Synod of Arles then celebrated, who decreeing that Eaſter ſhould be uniformly kept, intreated Pope Sylveſter, to direct his letters according to the Churches cuſtom all the world over for that end.

Nay, the Century writers of Magdeburg, enemies of the Catholik Church, and ſo renowned Proteſtants, that they have been ſtiled by their followers, *Men worthy of eternal memory*, even theſe do write of Conſtantin, (though with a deſign to diminiſh his honour) that he appointed a great holiday for the temples

ples dedication, which we in Engliſh call a *Wake*: that he favoured conſecrations and ſuperſtitious exornations of Churches; that he with other Chriſtians in thoſe times met for Gods ſervice only in conſecrated places: that he would have candles to burn in Churches in the day time; that ſuperſtitiouſly he ſent to Conſtantinople ſome reliques of the Croſs found by his mother Helena, for the preſervation of the City; that in Conſtantins time pilgrimages were much in uſe, and that his mother Helena went to the holy land to worſhip: that Prieſts were forbid to marry by the Synod of Arles, in the time of Emperour Conſtantin and Pope Sylveſter: that both under Conſtantin and long before his time were both Monks and Nuns ſpread all over Aſia, Syria, Paleſtin, Ægypt, Bithynia, &c. that Conſtantin did ſo reverence Byſhops, that he would not ſit amongſt them in the Nicen Councel, but in a lower ſeat: That the ſaid Emperour checked Akeſius for denying Prieſts to have power of forgiving ſins, bidding him ſet up a ladder for himſelf, and go up to heaven his own way all alone: and laſtly, that after his death they poured out tears and prayes every where for the Emperours ſoul.

And other Proteſtant writers many of them ſince, as Napper for example in an Engliſh treatiſe upon the Revelations, and Frigivillæus in

in a latin one called *Palma Christiana*, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, convinced by so palpable testimonies every where obvious, acknowledg the Christian Church in Constantins time to have been wholly Papistical. *After the year of God three hundred*, saith Napper, *the Emperour Constantin subjugated all Christian Churches to Pope Sylvester, from which time till these our dayes the Pope and his Clergy have possessed the outward visible Church.* And Prigivillæus in his wrath calls therupon the noble Emperour Constantin, the great Dragon who gave power to the Beast. Take it all in their own words.

Thus Eusebius; *Ab omni licentiâ & vitæ luxu diffluente sese vocavit, inediâ & corporis afflictione seipsum coercuit imperator*, l. 2. de vitâ Constantini, c. 14. *Atq; interdum vultum salutari illâ signavit notâ*, l. 3. c. 2. *Imperator triumphale signum honoravit*: and again, *In qua parte istud crucis vexillum visum fuit, hostes fugam capere, victores persequi. Quâ re intellectâ imperator sicubi partem aliquam sui exercitus languentem cernebat, ibi salutare illud vexillum tanquam quoddam subsidium ad victoriam obtinendam locari mandavit, cujus adjumentis extemplò parta est victoria: quippe dimicantium vires divina quadam potentiâ fuere admodum confirmatæ*, l. 2. c. 7. *Civitatem multis templis in honorem martyrum illustrissimisq; ædibus sacris adornavit*, l. 3. c. 47.

Cùm parva quædam ſella ex auro fabricata illi eſſet loco poſita, non prius conſedit quàm epiſcopi ad id annuiſſent, l. 3. c. 10. *Apoſtolorum templum ad perpetuam illorum memoriam conſervandam ædificare cæpit*, l. 4. c. 58. *In oportunum ventura mortis diem hic locum ſibi provida diſpenſatione deſignavit, ut defunctus quoq; precationum, quæ ibidem eſſent ad apoſtolorum gloriam offerendæ, particeps efficeretur*, l. 4. c. 60. *Sacerdotes alii qui horum nihil poterant efficere, incruentis conſecrationibus divinum numen placabant, & ſupplices Deo preces offerebant pro communi pace, pro eccleſia Dei, ipſoq; imperatore*, l. 4. c. 45. *Humi procumbens genibus in ipſa martyrum æde errata ſua confeſſus eſt, &c. Adhuc quidem licet contemplari ter beatæ animæ tumulum divinis ceremoniis & myſtico ſacrificio ſanctarumq; precationum ſocietate perfrui*, l. 4. c. 61. 71.

Thus Zozomen; *Tabernaculum eccleſiæ figuram exprimens, cùm contra hoſtes prælio contenderet, ſecum circumferre conſuevit imperator Conſtantinus ad eum finem, uti neq; ſibi in ſolitudine agenti neq; exercitui deeſſet æde ſacra, &c. Sacerdotes & diaconi tabernaculum aſſiduè ſecuti ſunt*, l. 1. c. 8. *Antonium magum illum monachum in ſolitudinibus Ægypti magnâ cum nominis & famæ celebritate vitam degentem Conſtantinus imperator propter ejus virtutis ſplendorem ſibi amicum fecit, literas honorificè ſcriptas ad eum miſit*, l. 1. c. 13. *Juſſit Conſtantinus, ut Concilio-*

rum

rum deciſiones firmæ & immutabiles exiſterent, l. 1. c. 9. *Mihi verò non eſt fas, cùm homo ſim, ejuſmodi cauſarum cognitionem arrogare*, l. 1. c. 16. *Sanctæ cruci plurimum tribuit honoris, tum propter ſubſidia in bello contra hoſtes gerendo ex ejus virtute ſibi allatâ, tum propter divinam ſibi de eâ oblatam viſionem*, l. 1. c. 8.

Thus the other Fathers; *Crucis charactere baſilicæ dedicantur, altaria conſecrantur*, Aug. ſerm. 19. de ſanctis. Bed. l. 1. c. 30. l. 5. c. 4. *Conſtantinus imperator ſanctas reliquias Andreæ, Lucæ, & Timothei tranſtulit Conſtantinopolin, ad quas dæmones rugiunt*, Hieron. contra Vig. *Nam & ipſe qui purpuram indutus eſt, accedit illa amplexus ſepulchra, & faſtu depoſito ſtat ſanctis ſupplicaturus, ut pro ſe ad Deum intercedat*, Chryſ. hom. 26. in ep. 2. Cor. *De obſervatione Paſchæ Domini conſtitutum eſt in hac Synodo, ut uno die & tempore per omnem orbem obſervetur: & juxta conſuetudinem, literas ad omnes Papa Sylveſter tu dirigas*, Conc. 1. Arelatenſe, can. 1.

Thus the Century writers, *Conſtantinus diem feſtum admodum ſolennem ad celebrandam dedicationem templi indixit*, Cent. 4. coll. 452. *Templorum recens extructorum conſecrationes, exornationes ſuperbas aliaque ſuperſtitioſa, quorum maximam partem Conſtantinus excogitavit, & in multas eccleſias propagavit*, coll. 497. *Chriſtianos in templis nondum conſecratis non conveniſſe clarè indicat Athanaſius*, coll. 408. *Accenſiones candelarum*

larum interdiu in templis Conſtantinus inſtituit, coll. 497. *Plane ſimili ſuperſtitione Conſtantinus reliquias quaſdam de cruce ab Helenâ repertâ Conſtantinopolinin dicitur tranſtuliſſe, ut eſſet ejus urbis conſervatrix*, coll. 1529. *Caperunt hoc ſæculo primùm ſub Conſtantino loca terræ ſanctæ, &c. in pretio haberi, &c. Helena mater imperatoris mulier ſuperſtitioſa illuc profecta eſt adorandi cauſâ*, coll. 457. *Secunda Synodus celebrata eſt Conſtantini imperatoris & Sylveſtri tempore, &c.* ubi can. 2. dicitur. *Aſſumi aliquem ad ſacerdotium, in vinculo conjugii conſtitutum, niſi fuerit promiſſa converſio, non oportet*, coll. 704. *Fuiſſe etiam ante Conſtantinum virgines ſeu mulieres continentes & caſtitatem perpetuam profeſſas ex libro quarto Euſebii de vita Conſtantini apparet; ubi magnopere approbaſſe diſciplinam ejuſmodi imperatorem Conſtantinum affirmat; adeo ut frequenter eorum contubernium adierit. Helenam vero Conſtantini matrem Hieroſolymis virgines Deo ſacras reperiſſe Socrates teſtatur, quarum profeſſionem uſque adeo probarit, ut miniſtram illis ſeſe præbuerit*, coll. 467. *Monachi per Syriam, Paleſtinam, Bythiniam, & reliqua Aſiæ loca ſub Conſtantino magno*, coll. 1294. *Notum eſt quam reverentiam & obſervantiam epiſcopis habuerit Conſtantinus in Synodo Nicæna; ubi nec conſedere prius quam epiſcopi annuiſſent, voluit*, coll. 460. *Ad pœnitentiam admoneri homines, ſpem verò remiſſionis non à ſacerdotibus ſed ab ipſo Deo expectare, &c. Cùm hæc dixiſſet*

dixisset Acesius, subjunxit imperator, Pone scalam & Acesi, & solus ascende in cœlum, coll. 653. *Turba frequens preces cum fletu pro animâ imperatoris fudit,* coll. 454.

Thus Frigivillæus Gauvius, *Constantinus tribuit Romano episcopo primatum ante omnes.* And again, *Ex eo apparet fatale fuisse, ut Constantinus daret potestatem bestiæ, quam statim Julius exercuit. Nam etiam Constantinus magnus ferebat arma draconis in insignis suis, &c. ita ut ipse sit draco, qui dedit potestatem bestiæ, & typus draconis serpentis antiqui,* Apoc. 13. *qui bestiæ potestatem dedit.* These words are in his Palma, p. 34.

And the same Centurists, learned and industrious Protestants, do manifesty acknowledg, although they also dislike it, even in that fourth age above thirteen hundred years ago, when the Christian Church first list up her head in the world, all in a manner practices, beleef and rites yet held in the Roman Church, and utterly now abolisht by the Protestant reformation, as then in vogue amongst the prelates and people of those times: for example, *the Primacy of the byshop of Rome deduced by divine right from that of S. Peter,* coll. 515. 551. 556. 458. *the single life of Priests,* 616. 486. *the sumptuousnes of consecrating Churches and celebrating Masses in hallowed places,* 497. *the rites used in ordination of deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers,*

door-keepers, and in the unction and consecration of Priests, 873 & 874. 435. *ecclesiastical vestments, the alb, the stole, Dalmatick, cope, mytre*, 504. 876. 835. *saying of prayers upon little stones or beads*, coll. 1329. *worshipping and estimation of the Cross*, 302. *praying towards the East*, 432. *canonical hours*, 433. *mattins in the night*, 459. *solemn funeral rites and prayer for the souls of the deceased*, 453, 454, 455. *Priests blessing of the bride and bridegroom after marriage*, 453. *prohibition of marriage as well as eating of flesh in Lent*, 453. 441. *consecration of monks and monasteries*, 466. *vowed chastity, poverty and abstinence, anchorets, hermits, their cells and austerity of life*, 470. 488. 300, 301. 471. 474. *Images in the Church, and candles there burning in the day time*, 409, 410. *solemn translation of Saints relicks, and placing them under the altar, with pilgrimages to them, wherat sick persons were miraculously cured*, 456, 457. 602. *consecration of baptismal water, and confirmation by a bysshop with chrysme*, 415. 420. 865. *sign of the cross in baptisme and exorcismes*, 421. 417. *Free-will, interiour justification and merit of good works*, 291, 292, 293. *confession of sins to a priest, pennance and absolution with imposition of hands*, 425. 834. *unwritten traditions*, 299. *invocation of Saints*, 295. *Purgatory*, 304. *altars consecrated with the sign of the cross and chrisme, called the seat of Christs body and blood*, 409. *real presence*

ſence and tranſubſtantiation, 209. 985. *the reſervation of that ſacrament, and offering it up a ſacrifice to God propitiatory both for the living and dead*, 427. 430. 985. *challice, coverings and holy veſſels which lay people might not touch*, 490. 835. *mixtur of water with wine in the chalice, in time of conſecration*, 480. In a word; all things which the Roman Catholik Church now beleevs and practiſes contrary to themſelves are acknowledged by thoſe learned Proteſtants in that fourth age to be ſo ſpread over the face of Chriſtianity, that many others of the ſame beleef with them have not feared to ſay, that the Church in thoſe dayes, when ſhe firſt lift up her head in the world, was Antichriſtian and Papiſtical. Popery then is no ſuch novelty, as Dr. Taylor imagines, or would have us at leaſt imagin it to be.

The Diſſwaſives ſecond Chapter.

That the Church of Rome uſes doctrins and practices that are directly or by conſequent impious, and give warranty to a wicked life.

"IS declared in 12. Sections. For the Roman doctrin teaches, ſaith he, that a *ſinner is not bound preſently to repent, and that contrition is of it ſelf of no value*, Sect. 1. Teaches "alſo, *a confeſſion that is frivolous, and either of*

" *ill or no consequence*, sect. 2. Teaches a *pen-*
" *nance that is ineffective*, sect. 3. Teaches *In-*
" *dulgences of no use*, sect. 4. Teaches other
" assertions attending hereon both fals and
" wicked; as that a habit of sin is no sin, and
" that one sin is venial, another mortal, sect. 5.
" Teaches, that a probable opinion may safely
" be followed, sect. 6. Teaches fond battolo-
" gies and prayers without attention, sect. 7.
" Teaches prayer to dead men, sect. 8. Teach-
" es fond and wicked exorisations and incanta-
" tions, sect. 9. Teaches new Sacraments with-
" out warrant, sect. 10. Teaches image-wor-
" ship against good life and vertue, sect. 11.
" Lastly, teaches the abuse of faith, hope, and
" charity. And so is demonstrated your Dis-
swaders second plea against Papists. But to an-
swer all this in a word, The Roman Church or
Catholik faith teaches none of this.

His third Chapter.

That the Roman Church teaches doctrins destructive of Christian society, and monarchy.

" IS shown in three sections. First, she teach-
" es it is lawful to lye and speak falsities.
" Secondly, she does intollerable prejudice to
" government by exemption of Clergy. Third-
" ly, subjects Princes to the Pope, and sepa-

rateth